

The State of Matarām: A Review of Recent Efforts To Clarify Its History

The State of Matarām: A Review of Recent Efforts To Clarify Its History.....	1
1. Forward.....	1
2. 'Raja-raja Mataram Kuna dari Sanjaya sampai Balitung': an evaluation.....	3
3. 'Revisiting Old Mataram': an evaluation.....	13
3a. "Phase one: foundation (A.D. 716-746)": an evaluation.....	16
3b. "Phase two: expansion and consolidation in Central Java (A.D. 746-827)": an evaluation.....	18
3c. "Phase three: new directions and eastward expansion (A.D. 828-885)": an evaluation.....	26
3d. "Phase four: political turbulence (A.D. 885-898)": an evaluation.....	32
3e. "Balitung and the first years of phase five: stabilization and growing East Javanese influence (A.D. 898-910)": an evaluation.....	33
3f. Summary evaluation of 'Revisiting Old Mataram'.....	35
4. Observations on future efforts to untangle the history of Śailendra-era Java.....	35
5. Bibliography:.....	38

1. Forward

The world of Javanese epigraphy is rife with frustrations. Inscriptions become unreadable at just the point when they become historically interesting; inscriptions were left unfinished for reasons unknown; three *sīma* boundary stones out of four are found, but the fourth remains obstinately undiscovered; epigraphical material is stolen¹ or goes inexplicably missing²; it is unclear whether or not a date is concealed in an unannounced word-game; a Klaten villager discovers the remains of a brick temple in his back yard and decides that the accompanying inscription would serve as an ideal piece of structural material to cement under the window in his house³.

The paucity of inscriptions from the first century and a half of the Mataram kingdom, the period from 716-856, is especially regrettable as this era saw the erection of nearly all the great Central Javanese temples. This period contains clear documentation of the presence on Javanese soil of a dynasty of kings who denominated themselves as the Śailendra, a dynasty which would later become kings of Śrī Vijaya even as their name was carried no longer on the Javanese soil which was home to their greatest stone monuments. With the advent and apparent fall of the Śailendra dynasty came the rise of a tantrically- inspired Mahāyāna Buddhism of a demonstrably cosmopolitan character, as well as monumental art of the highest order ever achieved on Indonesian soil.

The scholarly world of Javanese antiquity ramifies into many disciplines, touching on economics, architecture, archaeology, social history, art history, and the history of religions. The results of these studies depend on and are consequent to a detailed understanding of Javanese

¹ The stone of Kamalagi (821) was stolen in the early 1990's from the village of Kuburan Candi but was fortunately recovered by the Indonesian police in Surabaya harbor before it could be transported to the art shops of Singapore. (Source: personal communication with the village headman of Kuburan Candi.)

² I refer to the important Buddhist inscriptions of Boyolali (771 A.D.) and Plaosan, both of which will be discussed more extensively later in this essay.

³ This story, despite sounding odd, is true; I personally found this man while on the trail of several of the discoveries reported by Sukarto-Kartoatmodjo in the area near Jatinom, to the north of Klaten.

political power and regnal history. For reasons of its primacy in pinning down the foundation for all other disciplines, it is probably safe to say that it is the development of Javanese royal history that is most in need of getting right, or at least of doing as well as possible. During his unfortunately brief scholarly career, L. C. Damais regularly offered up to his readership informative, informed, expert, competently-written, and thought-provoking reviews and appraisals of the latest developments and publications in Indonesian antiquity. I myself have profited immensely from acquaintance with the uniquely illuminating perspectives and analysis he brought to bear on, especially, the work of de Casparis (see Damais 1968) almost two generations ago. I can only modestly hope that there is a faint echo of Damais in the care and detail which I have attempted to bring to this review.

The essays under review, 'Raja-raja Mataram Kuna dari Sanjaya sampai Balitung: sebuah rekonstruksi berdasarkan prasasti Wanua Tengah III'⁴ (hereafter to be abbreviated as 'RRM') by Kusen (1994) and 'Revisiting Old Mataram'⁵ (hereafter to be abbreviated as 'ROM') by Jan Wisseman-Christie (2001), are two attempts to reconstruct a history of Central Java primarily based on the inscription, dating from the time of King Balitung, called Wanua Tengah III after the Temanggung-area toponym it treats. Kusen was the first epigrapher to examine the inscription after its finding, and his original faculty research paper⁶ at Universitas Gajah Madah was the adjunct of his effort to translate the inscription after it was found in 1983. As Kusen's RRM has never received the detailed critical review that it deserves despite numerous citations in academic papers, I will offer a detailed account devoted to his efforts, which serve both as background for a comparison with Wisseman-Christie's more extensive and more accessible effort as well as to alert the English-language reader of several important research results obtained as the result of his efforts.

To initiate this review, we must establish our subject, the reconstruction of the history of the kings of Matarām, by placing it on firm chronological ground. Both of the authors provide the reader with Julian dates that have been mis-synthesized from their Javanese elements. While this might seem like a quibble, it has caused both authors to focus undue attention to the reign of the previously unknown *dyah* Gula, a king or queen whose reign was not the brief 6 month reign assumed by both Kusen and Wisseman-Christie, but rather a reign three times as long, lasting well over a year and a half. The Indonesian epigrapher Trigangga (1994) has provided a rather complete study of the dates provided in the inscription following the method of Damais, and with one possible exception, the dates proposed by Trigangga should be accepted in favor of those given by Kusen and Wisseman-Christie.

For the sake of historical accuracy, the dates for the events chronicled in the inscription of Wanua Tengah III must be amended, mostly per Trigangga, as follows:

Coronation of Panangkaran:	27 November 746 as given by Kusen and 7 October 746 as given by Wisseman-Christie must be corrected to 3 October 746.
----------------------------	---

⁴ *Berkala Arkeologi*, Edisi Khusus, 1994, pp. 82-94.

⁵ In Klokke and Kooij, eds, *Fruits of Inspiration: Studies in Honour of Prof. J.G. de Casparis*, Egbert Forsten- Groningen, 2001, pp. 25-57.

⁶ Kusen, *Faktor-faktor Penyebab Terjadinya Perubahan Status Sawah di Wanua Tengah Dalam Masa Pemerintahan Raja-raja Mataram Kuna Abad 8-10*, Laporan Penelitian Fakultas Sastra UGM.

Coronation of Panaraban:	1 April 784 as given by both must be corrected to 6 March 784.
Coronation of Warak:	28 March 803 as given must be corrected to 3 March 803 ⁷ .
Coronation of Gula:	5 August 827 as given must be corrected to 26 July 827.
Coronation of Garung:	24 January 828 as given must be corrected to 10 January 829 ⁸ .
Garung's restoration of sīma:	4 November 829 ⁹ .
Coronation of Pikatan:	22 February 847 as given must be corrected to 6 March 847.
Coronation of Kayuwangi:	27 May 855 as given must be corrected to 8 June 855 ¹⁰ .
Coronation of Tagwas:	5 February 885 as given must be corrected to 17 February 885.
Coronation of Dewindra:	27 September 885 as given must be left as merely 'September- October, 885' ¹¹
Coronation of Bhadra:	27 January 887 as given must be corrected to 18 January 887.
Beginning of leaderlessness:	24 February 887 as given must be corrected to 13 February 887.
Coronation of Wuñkalmalang:	27 November 894 as given must be corrected to 21 November 894 ¹² .
Coronation of Balitung:	23 May 898 as given must be corrected to 10 May 898.
Independence of all monasteries:	12 November 904.
Decision in favor of vihāra at Pikatan:	15 October 905 as given must be corrected to 14 October 905.
Restoration of sīma status:	8 September 908.

2. '*Raja-raja Mataram Kuna dari Sanjaya sampai Balitung*': an evaluation

Kusen (1994:82) declares his motives: "This article will review historical data which was contained in the inscription of Wanua Tengah III, especially which is concerned with the kings of ancient Mataram which for the time being has been neglected by the editorial staff of the *Sejarah Nasional Indonesia II*. Then a historical reconstruction of kings beginning with Sanjaya to Balitung will

⁷ In one of the rare errors associated with the normally meticulous work of L.C. Damais, his pioneering table (Damais: 1952 appendix 1) of the starting dates of cycles contains an error in exactly this entry. The beginning of the cycle falls on 25 September, 802, not 22 September 802 as published. The other two errors in Damais' table: the entries for the column for the years 158, 438 ... must begin on 20 March and 19 October. I have written a computer program which reduces Javanese calendrical data to Julian equivalents- this program is freely available upon request from the author.

⁸ Trigangga calculates that the cycle of days is miswritten and must be amended to from the transcribed Pa U Ā to Wa U Ā in order that the date accord with the reported month and lunar reporting. I agree fully with the amendment as a Javanese 'pa' and a 'wa' differ only by the closure of the superior arc.

⁹ This date is given twice, once in the Sanskrit excerpt of Garung's administrative decision and again in its Old Javanese translation. While the Sanskrit provides '*caturdaśi*', the Old Javanese reads '*caturthi*'. Trigangga notes that the *caturdaśi* must be rewritten as *caturthi* from the Old Javanese portion.

¹⁰ Trigangga notes that Ha Wa Śa must be amended to Ha U Śa.

¹¹ Trigangga calculates 3 Oct 885, the date stipulated by the lunar reading, by suggesting that Pa Pa Bu be amended to Tu U Ā. I cannot fully approve of this suggestion as it requires that the scribe miswrote all three characters. It is difficult to recover the true date for this event, despite my confirmation of the accuracy of Kusen's transliteration against the copperplate itself.

¹² Trigangga notes that Tu Pa Bu must be changed to Tu Pa Wṛ.

be offered in order to show the high quality of historical value which is contained in the inscription of Wanua Tengah III. In the end it is hoped that the contents of the article could become one of the foundations in the rewriting of the history of the kings of ancient Mataram at the present time."

As a warm-up to his full-bore analysis, Kusen (pp. 82-83) offers a short excerpt of the bare-bones royal history as presented in the inscription of Wanua Tengah III, and then (pp. 83-84) reprises the king list in a slightly more elaborate fashion in an effort to prove the authenticity of the dates provided by the Wanua Tengah III inscription by correlation against the extant body of Javanese inscriptions. In this phase of his essay, Kusen's effort is cursory and oriented toward the presentation of data, trying to establish the independent existence of kings as verified by their mention in other inscriptions. In doing so, he commits several mistakes that should be rectified. First, his flat statement that the Garung of the 819 Pěngging inscription is identical to the later king of that title needs proof, or at least an argument for its plausibility. The information that the name of Rakai Pikatan appears in the dual inscriptions of Wanua Tengah 1 and 2 of 863 is erroneous; the reference must obviously be changed to the dual inscriptions of Tulang Er of 850. The list of inscriptions which mention Kayuwangi is strangely hollow, with token mention made only of the inscriptions of Śivagrha, Wanua Tengah 1, and Kwāk 1, thus ignoring the numerous other inscriptions that date from his time and mention his name.

Kusen notes that the inscription of Wanua Tengah III only mentions the coronation dates of kings, omitting explicit details about the end-date of their reigns. Kusen therefore always lists the termination of a given king's reign as 'before or on' the date of his successor's advent to the throne. This caution of his is praiseworthy, as we know almost nothing about the nature of royal succession.

His survey of corroborating material complete, Kusen then launches himself on an errand that he explicitly calls a reconstruction of the kings from Sañjaya to Balitung, treating the kings one by one without any attempt to associate broader trends in Javanese society with the reigns of specific kings or groups of kings. I will follow his efforts by adopting his structure, but will first examine closely the interwoven chronological calculations that suffuse the essay and provide the bones for many of his assertions about the interrelations of personalities on the ancient Central Javanese scene.

Let us illustrate this type of chronological analysis and consequent results. Kusen (p. 87) handles the question of the semi-anonymous parent (who is referred to only by the burial epithet of *saṃ lumāh i tūk* in the inscription) of King Garung in a manner that is typical of the manner in which he carries out the development of the analysis:

"Whoever *sang lumāh i tuk* was is not yet known because there are no other sources which mention him. However so, note Garung's strong position; less than one year after he ascended the throne Rake Garung restored the status of the *sima*-fields at Wanua Tengah which was previously withdrawn by Rake Warak, so his father probably was the king who held the throne before Rake Warak, that is, Rake Panaraban. To strengthen this conjecture it is necessary to make a chronological counting as follows- before becoming king Rake Garung already issued an inscription in the year 819 A.D. (OV 1920: 136). If in the year 819 A.D. he was ± 25 years, then Rake Garung was born around the year 794 A.D. In the year 794 A.D., the age of Rake Panaraban was ± 35 years so that from the considerations of age Rake Panaraban properly becomes the father of Rake Garung.' If the

assumption given above is true then Rake Garung is the younger sibling of Rake Warak and as well the uncle of Dyaḥ Gula. As such probably Rake Garung already seized the throne from the hand of his own nephew who was still a youth at the time he assumed the throne.'

In the chart of royal relationships appended to the article, Kusen labels this hypothesis with the rubric '*dugaan cukup kuat*' or 'Guess sufficiently strong'.

In opposition to Kusen's pronouncement that his guess was sufficiently strong, we must note the cascade of hypotheses that brought him to this point. (The reader will hopefully bear with my tedious recounting of the speculations which yielded this conclusion, as they serve to illustrate the general methodology.) Kusen hypothesizes that Panangkaran was about 20-25 years old at the time he took the throne, and was thus born in about the 6th year of his alleged father's reign. Panangkaran's son, Panaraban, took his throne at about the age of 25 years, which places his birth approximately 13 years into Panangkaran's reign. Warak is considered the son of Panaraban and is hypothesized to take his throne at the age of about 25 years, so was born about 5 years before his father assumed the throne of Matarām. Garung is also hypothesized to be the son of Panaraban, who at the time of the 819 *sīma* decision was already an adult of a hypothetical age of 25. Garung is thus born about 10 years into his father's reign, 15 years after his alleged brother Warak, and seizes power from Warak's adolescent son, no other adult heir being available despite a 24-year reign. We cannot comment upon the correctness of Kusen's methods as we quite simply do not know when any of these kings were born, but his hypothetical insistence that the coronation of these kings occur in every case at the age of 20-25 yields birth years which to me are too far advanced into their father's reigns. This consideration is even more important given the presumed importance to the political stability of the kingdom by the king's siring of a valid heir. Given the long reigns of the early kings of Matarām (Panangkaran's active reign alone spanned 38 years, following upon the heels of an apparently 29 year reign by Sañjaya), it is difficult to see the validity of Kusen's methodology. We certainly should not term the results of Kusen's cascaded speculations anything near the 'sufficiently strong' label that he accorded his own results.

For the reader's edification, here are the various elements of the hypothesized Matarām chronology as pulled together from various parts of Kusen's narrative. His method is largely based on the assumption that rulers take the throne when they are 20-25 years of age.

717	Advent of Sañjaya to throne
	c. 723 hypothesized birth of Panangkaran
746	Advent of Panangkaran to throne at age of c. 23 years.
	c. 759 birth of Panaraban to Panangkaran, 36 years old
	c. 776 birth of Śrī Kahulunnan
	c. 778 birth of Warak to Panaraban, 19 years old
	c. 781 birth of Samaratuṅga to Panangkaran, 58 years old
784	Advent of Panaraban to throne
	c. 794 birth of Rake Garung to Panaraban, 35 years old
803	Advent of Warak to throne
	c. 805 birth of Pikatan
	c. 806 birth of Pramodavarddhani

827 Advent of Gula to the throne
 c. 830 birth of Kayuwangi

For contrast, the following is a table of the consequences of the various elements of the hypothesized Matarām chronology if kings who are old enough to govern are considered to have their primary heir in the beginning year of their reign, and that the laws of male primogeniture apply. I do not wish to endorse this table as my own personal opinion, but I do believe that the results are more likely to be valid than the research results of RRM because there are more plausible ages of fatherhood for the kings.

717 advent of Sañjaya to throne, birth of Panangkaran
 746 advent of Panangkaran to throne at age 29; birth of Panaraban
 c. 772 or before: birth of Samaratuṅga
 784 death of Panangkaran at age of 67; advent of Panaraban to throne at age of 38; birth of Warak
 c. 792 or earlier? or later? birth of Pramodavarddhani and Balaputradeva
 803 death of Panaraban at age of 58 years; advent of Warak to throne at age of 19; birth of Gula
 827 death of Warak at age 43; advent of Gula to the throne at age of 24; birth of Garung
 829 death of Gula at age 26; advent of Garung to the throne at age 1 1/2.

I redraw the chronological table once again, this time working under the assumption that crown princes marry and begin producing children at the age of 23¹³, no matter at what age they inherit the throne. We know nothing about the birth of Sañjaya; there is every likelihood that the Sañjaya era is dated to his coronation and not his birth (Damais 1968: 369-369). Just to get the ball rolling, we will assume that Sañjaya is likely to be sexually mature if he can rule a kingdom.

717 advent of Sañjaya to throne, birth of Panangkaran
 740: birth of Panaraban
 746 advent of Panangkaran to throne at age 29
 763: birth of Warak
 c. 772 or before: birth of Samaratuṅga
 784 death of Panangkaran at age of 67; advent of Panaraban to throne at age of 44
 c. 792 or earlier? or later? birth of Pramodavarddhani and Balaputradeva
 786: birth of dyah Gula
 803 death of Panaraban at age of 63 years; advent of Warak to throne at age of 40
 809: birth of Garung
 827 death of Warak at the age of 64; advent of Gula to the throne at age of 41
 829 death of Gula at the age of 43; advent of Garung to the throne at the age of 20.
 832 birth of Pikatan

¹³ This would be half the lifespan of an average American at the turn of the last century. Given the tropical climate and poor sanitation, it is possible that the ancient inhabitants of Java began child-bearing as soon after puberty as possible. Unfortunately absolutely nothing is known of the reproductive habits of aristocratic Javanese at this time.

847	death of Garung at the age of 38; advent of Pikatan at the age of 15
853:	birth of Kayuwangi
855	death of Pikatan at the age of 23; advent of Kayuwangi at the age of 2.

Again one more table, with the same underlying assumptions as the table above but this time with the inter-generational births spaced only 20 years apart.

717	advent of Sañjaya to throne, birth of Panangkaran
737:	birth of Panaraban
746	advent of Panangkaran to throne at age 29
757:	birth of Warak
c. 772 or before:	birth of Samaratuṅga
784	death of Panangkaran at age of 67; advent of Panaraban to throne at age of 47
c. 792 or earlier? or later?	birth of Pramodavarddhani and Balaputradeva
777:	birth of dyaḥ Gula
803	death of Panaraban at age of 66 years; advent of Warak to throne at age of 46
797:	birth of Garung
817	birth of Pikatan
827	death of Warak at the age of 70; advent of Gula to the throne at age of 50
829	death of Gula at the age of 52; advent of Garung to the throne at the age of 32.
837	birth of Kayuwangi
847	death of Garung at the age of 50; advent of Pikatan at the age of 30
855	death of Pikatan at the age of 38; advent of Kayuwangi at the age of 18.
885	death of Kayuwangi at the age of 48; beginning of civil war.

Again, it is important to stress that no probative value can be attached to this series of speculative tables; they merely assist the reader in evaluating whether or not he or she should accept Kusen's methodology as presented in his essay. However, it should be reemphasized that Kusen's chronological assumptions everywhere suffuse and color his analysis- they are the primary vehicles through which he infers relationships between the royal personalities.

Kusen begins his reconstruction of the kings of Matarām with Sañjaya. Under Sañjaya, Kusen surmises from the existence of two¹⁴ Sañjaya-dated inscriptions that Sañjaya must have come to the throne in 717 (Damais proved this in his 1955 study of the dates of Javanese inscriptions and reiterated his conclusion in Damais 1968:368-369, but these French-language publications are unlikely to have come to Kusen's notice) and further surmises that Sañjaya ruled until the advent of Panangkaran. At our present state of understanding, Kusen's assumption about the relationship between Sañjaya and Panangkaran is probable but not certain; one of the blind spots in the historical coverage of the Wanua Tengah III inscription is precisely the period between the kingship of Sañjaya and the start of Panangkaran's kingship in 746, and we can hypothesize many potential relationships between the king and his high nobles. Kusen notes that Wanua Tengah III is not explicit about the identity of its *Rahyanṭa i Mḍanṭ* but that it probably denotes Sañjaya, who apparently had a Buddhist

¹⁴ In reality, four are known at the present time, although only two are cross-dated. All date from the period of Dakṣottama nearly two centuries later.

relative. This seems probable, as the name of Sañjaya is linked to Mḍaṅ in the later Mantyaṣiḥ inscription (I.B.7-8), though interestingly as a temporal location and not as the place of his deification.

Panangkaran is denoted as a king who favored Buddhism. He is assumed to have issued the inscriptions of Kālasan (778), Kēlurak (782), and Abhayagirivihāra (792); the first assumption is probably true¹⁵, the second is presently unprovable, and the latter is seemingly incorrect, although Kusen was led to believe that Panangkaran's name is mentioned there. As Kusen notes that nothing in the Wanua Tengah III inscription compels that Panangkaran died on the throne, he hypothesizes that Panangkaran resigned the throne after a rule of 38 years in order to join the monastery, which accounts for the mention of his name in the inscription of Abhayagirivihāra. We might reply that the alleged monastic ordination is unlikely to have taken place with Panangkaran still maintaining his former territorial title and personal name; we should certainly expect a Buddhist ordination name to be used, or at least a sacred consecration name. Furthermore, personal inspection of the Abhayagirivihāra stone leads me to strongly doubt the existence of the name Panangkaran as asserted by De Casparis (1950:11-23, 1961:277 n. 22). I hope to offer more on the inscription of Abhayagirivihāra on a later occasion.

In his discussion of Panaraban (pp. 83, 85), Kusen has reached back to the older archeological reports and made a connection of very particular importance. Citing Suhamir 1950:36, Kusen identified Panaraban as the initiator of a mantra-inscription found at the large gate of the Ratu Baka plateau¹⁶.

The treatment of the period of Warak (pp. 85-86) is extensive. Kusen hypothesizes that Warak was a Hindu rather than a Buddhist, as his epithet seems to indicate his interment at the Mount Kailash, the abode of Shiva. Furthermore, Warak abrogated Panangkaran's *sīma* for the family monastery at Pikatan. Because of the long reign, a smooth political climate is assumed, an indicator to Kusen that Warak was the legitimate heir to the throne and thus the child of Panaraban. This genealogy is consistent with the chronological estimates obtained by Kusen through his assumption that Warak was approximately 25 years old when he assumed the throne.

A substantial portion of Kusen's treatment of Warak concerns the inscription of Kayumwungan of 824 A.D., which concerns the foundation by the Śailendra king Samaratuṅga and his daughter Pramodavarddhanī of several Buddhist edifices in Central Java. Kusen identifies Samaratuṅga with the Samarāgravīra of the inscription of Nālandā (dated by Kusen 1994:85 to 'about 850 A.D.'). Kusen believes that the father of Samaratuṅga must be Panangkaran and he allegedly used the epithet of 'Killer of Brave Enemies'¹⁷. Kusen employs a chronological argument to show the plausibility of an

¹⁵ For conflicting views on this inscriptions, see Lokesh Chandra 1994:214-217 and van Naersson 1947.

¹⁶ For more on this inscription, which associates Panaraban with a tantric Buddhist deity of wrath, see Sundberg 2003, Jordaan and Colless 2003, and Sundberg 2006 n. 25.

¹⁷ Kusen does not document the issue but rather argues to the authority of Sumadio 1992: 112-113, who also asserts without proof the identity of Śailendra and Sañjaya. One wishes that the evidence

advanced-age Panangkaran fathering Samaratuṅga but the argument fails to be convincing because it is built upon too many levels of hypothesized ages. Even Kusen notes the difficulties suggested by his chronological analysis, and suggests that they could be resolved if it were allowed that Panaraban too used the epithet of 'Killer of Brave Enemies'. From the results of his chronological analysis, Kusen has convinced himself that Samaratuṅga and Warak are distinct but genetically related individuals, on the basis of Samaratuṅga's patronage of Buddhism and Warak's alleged Śaivism. I agree that Samaratuṅga and Warak are distinct, not on the grounds cited by Kusen but rather because de Casparis' research has Samaratuṅga already regent by the time of the 792 inscription of Abhayagirivihāra, a crucial fact which seems to have escaped Kusen's attention¹⁸ but does not invalidate much of what he writes about the 824 inscription. Kusen reasons that on the basis of the apparent lack of land available to Samaratuṅga and Pramodavarddhanī (the actual *sīma* territory for their temples came courtesy of the Rakryān Patapān) that Samaratuṅga had no Javanese lands to give and thus never ruled at all in Java, something which reminds Kusen of the Nālandā *sīma* endowments made on behalf of Bālaputradeva. Kusen find this assertion strengthened by the absence of Samaratuṅga's name from the inscription of Wanua Tengah III, and continues on the basis of his ongoing chronological hypotheses to assert that Warak is the nephew of Samaratuṅga although they were of the same age. Kusen then raises the important question of why Samaratuṅga and Pramodavarddhanī sought financial assistance from the Rakryān Patapān rather than from King Warak himself, and answers his question by suggesting that their personal relationship with Warak was poor, possibly related to Warak's retraction of the Wanua Tengah *sīma* which Kusen believes was originally benefacted by Samaratuṅga's alleged father Panangkaran.

Kusen (p.86) summarizes the situation by suggesting that Samaratuṅga never ruled in Java but rather in Śrī Vijaya, into whose throne he married at the time of the nuptial contract with Tārā, princess of Śrī Vijaya. For some reason unknown but to himself, Kusen adjoins two more astoundingly speculative hypotheses: that Samaratuṅga's mother came from Sumatra as the bride of Panangkaran, which event Kusen seemingly associates with the inscription of Ligor of 775, and also that Panangkaran must have defeated Śrī Vijaya and taken a wife, future mother of Samaratuṅga, from there. These hypotheses deserve to be scrutinized very carefully, touching as they do upon crucial questions for the understanding of the essence of the Śailendra dynasty and its power centers in Java and Sumatra. Going beyond Kusen's misdating of Samaratuṅga, who cannot have been born much after 775 A.D. if he was already reigning as the Śailendra king in 792, we note several internal contradictions in Kusen's arguments and discrepancy between the evidence and Kusen's theories. How do we explain the fact that Bālaputradeva provided a genealogy which mentioned the epithet of his Śailendra ancestor, the 'Killer of Brave Enemies' and the fact that he ruled over Java but omitting

were stronger for this assertion.

¹⁸ Until recently, the 1961 de Casparis article was available to Kusen and the Yogyakarta reading public in only one very obscure, dim, and unindexed compendium of blurrily photocopied literature in the Archaeology Library of Univesitas Gajah Mada.

mention of the fact that the 'Killer' also ruled Śrī Vijaya by right of conquest? How could Bālaputradeva's maternal grandfather, Dharmasetu, presumed loser of a great maritime empire to 'The Killer', still be mentioned with equal prominence with Bālaputradeva's paternal grandfather? Why indeed the need to mention the allegedly conquered Śrī Vijayan side of the family at all, much less marry them at two different generational levels? Moving to other Śailendra inscriptions, why is the face of the Ligor inscription indisputably associated with the regent of Śrī Vijaya dated to 775 A.D., a time only 17 years before the alleged child of Panangkaran's hypothesized war-spoils bride sat firmly on the Śailendra throne? What do we make of the truncated nature of the Śailendra side of the Ligor inscription? What year does it date to? Does it show any evidence of being a war document composed by the Śailendras? If indeed Śrī Vijaya was previously defeated by Panangkaran, what was the value of having his alleged son Samaratuṅga marry the daughter of Dharmasetu, and why was the fact of this bilateral royal descent of such importance to Bālaputradeva? How did Samaratuṅga come to rule only Sumatra but perform multiple acts of temple-building in Central Java? For all these reasons, we should probably deem Kusen's hypotheses to be exceedingly unlikely at best, but in any case unwarranted.

RRM (pp. 86-87) next takes up the case of *dyaḥ* Gula, whose reign, as mentioned above, is misdated. In the figure of Gula and the short reign, Kusen sees indications that *dyaḥ* Gula was a young crown prince and Warak's child heir, who at the time of his coronation was too young to rule a fiefdom as a Raka. To this, we must oppose the objection that, after 24 years on the throne, Warak is highly likely to have had at least one male heir of suitable age, especially given that one of his primary concerns would be to produce and nurture a male heir. While there is no telling the freak effects of a cholera epidemic, a fit of fratricidal frenzy, heavy losses among the princes in a military expedition, etc, which may account for a child's advent to the throne, such are mere speculations. Certainly, however, we should consider it equally reasonable that a coronation coming hard on the heels of more than a century of long-reigned kings must have left precious few years for Gula to enjoy the kingship (queenship? We know nothing of Gula's gender) he had so long waited for. Before we can say for certain, we must wait for better data.

Kusen's treatment of the *Raka* of Garung (p. 87) is extensive and develops some interesting facts about the relationship between the reign of Garung and the building of the shrines and stupas at Plaosan Lor. These represent some very solid and very real gains for the understanding of the history of Javanese architecture¹⁹. Kusen was heavily involved in research on the topics of both Candi Plaosan and on the inscription of Wanua Tengah III, which he in his role as consultant for the Indonesian Department of Antiquities was the first to examine and translate. Kusen managed to correlate some data from the short temple dedications of Plaosan and the Sanskrit excerpt of

¹⁹ In a testimony to exactly how fragile understandings of ancient Central Javanese history can be, the scholarly efforts of Kusen in his effort to amplify the Wanua Tengah III inscription have disproven one of the seemingly firmest results of the epigraphical researches of de Casparis (1958), namely that the shrines at Plaosan were built by the Rakai Pikatan with the aid of a Buddhist queen, Śrī Kahulunnan.

Garung's 829 *sīma* decision, noting (p. 87) that the *Raka* of Sirikan *pu* Sūryya, who accompanied Garung to the fields of Wanua Tengah in 829, also donated two shrines in the Plaosan temple complex²⁰. Furthermore, he points out that the 842 inscription of Śrī Kahulunnan, whoever she may be, comes from the period of Garung and that her shrines too populate the Plaosan complex. He therefore concludes that the '*Śrī Mahārāja*' of the many votive temples within the precinct must be Garung and not Pikatan as previously thought. Kusen's hypothesis explains well why Pikatan's inscriptions from Plaosan run across two faces of their *harmikā*: the first line gives Pikatan's personal name and his territorial title from before he gained the crown; while upon his coronation he prefaced his donation with a second inscription indicating that he had become king.

The figure of the *Raka* of Pikatan presents some difficulties for Kusen, who takes the withdrawal of the *sīma* provisions for the fields at Wanua Tengah as an indicator that Pikatan was the son-in-law of Warak. Kusen judges this result on the basis of a chronological estimate of the age of Kayuwangi, and then using his previous chronological and kinship hypotheses deduces that Pikatan must have been the son-in-law to Warak; his sister was therefore a sister of *Dyaḥ* Gula. Needless to say, these estimates are extraordinarily hazardous for use as a basis for any reconstruction.

In the context of the 856 inscription of Śivagrha, an inscription for which there are many interpretations, Kusen offers a new one, one that is not at all implausible: the war mentioned in that inscription seemingly references a struggle between the survivors of Garung and the group around Pikatan who had seized power from *dyaḥ* Gula, the rightful heir. About this I can say nothing, noting that there is no evidence either for or against this assertion, other than to note that this hypothesis requires that Gula's champions would have had to nurse their dynastic grudge for 28 years and for the duration of the reign of two kings.

Focusing on the reign of Kayuwangi, Kusen treats the figure of Kumbhayoni rather ambivalently, noting that he cannot be firmly placed within the relationship structure of the kings of Wanua Tengah, but seeming to believe Boechari's hypothesis that Kumbhayoni had some relationship with the Garung group and that his rights to the throne were snatched away by Pikatan. If this hostile relationship existed between Kumbhayoni and the Pikatan/Kayuwangi group who disinherited him, one wonders why Kumbhayoni's inscriptions cover a period of at least 7 years and why they were allowed to stand unmolested on the Ratu Boko plateau; Kayuwangi remained on the throne until the year 885 and had plenty of time to expunge the offensive rebel inscriptions, which instead lay in place for 1100 years before their removal to museums and warehouses. In an aside speculation, Kusen wonders whether or not the figure of the *Rahyangta i Hara* from the inscription of

²⁰ Personal inspection of the relevant side-by-side Sirikan shrines at Plaosan Lor leads me to note that only one of the attribution inscriptions is complete and intact, the other being truncated after '*pu* Sū...'. This would be a quibble were the characters on both shrines inscribed by the same hand, but I15's are twice the height of I14's. For this reason we should leave open the slender possibility that two different Sirikans were involved at Plaosan, one of whom was the *pu* Sūryya who accompanied Garung in 829.

Wanua Tengah III might not be identical to the *Sang Ratu i Halu*, but notes that this is a question without an answer.

Taking up the issue of Kayuwangi's successors, Kusen tenders the notion that the first of them, *Dyah* Tagwas, was a titleless, juvenile son of Kayuwangi who was ousted from the throne after six months. The next contender for the throne was *Dyah* Dewendra, in whom Kusen somehow sees a descendent of Rake Garung whose rights to the throne were usurped 40 years before by the Pikatan faction. In the figure of *Dyah* Bhadra, the last of the short-reigning trio, Kusen seizes upon his territorial title of Rake Gurunwangi to hypothesize that there is some connection with the Rake Pikatan *Dyah* Saladu, who also held this title before his assumption of the throne. The arguments here are shaky, and accepting them forces us into a conclusion that all other kings, ruling over variously denominated *rakadoms*, must therefore not be patrilineally related to each other. It frankly would be much better to avoid speculation about the antecedents of the trio of contenders until archaeological luck provides us with some more epigraphical givings.

Resuming his narrative after the period from 887-894 when the kingdom was without a declared king, Kusen takes up the *Rake* Wungkalhumalang *Dyah* Jbang, noting that there are no indications of his antecedents or how he obtained the throne of Matarām.

In the final turn of attention in his analysis, Kusen observes that the grant of independence to all monasteries and the specific restoration of *sīma* status to the fields at Wanua Tengah, as well as the inclusion of the excerpt from *Rake* Garung's original Sanskrit inscription, shows some special relationship between Balitung and the *Rake* Garung. This conclusion, not impossible, might be questioned as the present inscriptional evidence offers us no other indication of Balitung's favoritism for Garung, and the Javanese-Sanskrit legal excerpts²¹ do not make especial mention of Garung.

Kusen offers a conclusion with several points. The first addresses the differences between the inscriptions of Mantyāsiḥ and that of Wanua Tengah. In the former inscription, Kusen sees an effort of self-legitimation, so that the inscription only mentioned the kings who had a grip on the whole of their kingdoms: Gula, Tagwas, Dewendra, and Bhadra were denied mention because they never had a hold on the bounds of the entire kingdom, which Kusen believes is demonstrated by the brevity of their reigns and the fact that they were explicitly overthrown. (This last point is true except for the case of *dyah* Gula, whose fate is completely unknown.) In the inscription of Wanua Tengah III, Kusen notes that the king-list was offered in legal documentation of a royal decision to alter the status of the fields of Wanua Tengah. We may accept his opinion here.

Kusen offers a final note that it is obvious that the succession to the Javanese throne did not always proceed smoothly. However, Kusen labors to convince the reader that the struggles for power were a family affair, all occurring between descendents of Sañjaya and not in a war between two families, Sañjaya and Śailendra. This last point is extraordinarily difficult to accept as an element of Kusen's summary because one of the fundamental faults of his article is its total refusal to address

²¹ I will present a study of Garung's decision to restore the tax status of the fields at Wanua Tengah on a later occasion.

the problem of '*Śailendra-ness*'. It is known that some of the greatest works of Javanese religious architecture were built up in the plains of Prambanan and the upper Keḍu by a family explicitly self-designated as the Śailendra, the 'lords of the rock' or 'lords of the mountain'. Their scion, Bālaputradeva, in communication with an Indian regent who stood among the forefront of the most powerful kings in India, proudly proclaimed himself to be an ornament of the Śailendra dynasty, noting that he was son of the Śailendra king Samarāgravīra and the Soma dynasty princess Tārā. It is an enormously difficult question to address how the luster of the name of this extraordinarily radiant family could have died out so quickly and so thoroughly after the issuance of the last known Javanese Śailendra inscription by Samaratuṅga's daughter in 824. How could the kings of the 830's and afterwards have failed to claim participation in the name of this dynasty, even when they built their younger, smaller, simpler temples in the shadow of the great temples of the Śailendra? If the 'Sañjaya' were truly Śailendra all along, where did their family name originate and why did the Javanese throne holders abandon it even while it persisted in Sumatra for at least two centuries? Why has the cardinal figure of Samaratuṅga been shunted off into the sidelines of the family tree as drawn by Kusen when his brethren no longer carried or cared to carry the dynastic name? How could the great heights of Sanskrit scholarship so evident in Śailendra inscriptions have fallen so quickly by the wayside if there was dynastic continuity among the descendents of Sañjaya? The summary paragraph in the essay is no place for Kusen to be declaring *as proven* important issues which were not even raised in his essay.

In toto, Kusen's efforts were the first taken in the direction of a reconstruction of Indonesian history based on the inscription of Wanua Tengah III, for which Kusen deserves praise for making the first pioneering translations. His reconstruction is based very heavily upon a chronological analysis which relies upon a general assumption that the kings whose accession dates are chronicled in the inscription came to their throne at the age of 20-25 years, an assumption that, as we have seen, has awkward and flatly unbelievable implications for the sexual potency of their fathers. With these fundamental chronological assumptions removed, those lines on the genealogical diagram which Kusen labels as 'sufficiently strong guesses' must be relegated to the status of unlikely speculations. Kusen also fails to refute the powerful notion that there were two dynasties in ancient Central Java, one of which explicitly termed itself the Śailendra dynasty during its hyperachieving 60 year term in power and the other of which, the ultimate victors of the struggle, had seemingly no desire whatsoever to represent itself with the Śailendra name despite an apparent multitude of opportunities. For these two reasons, Kusen's efforts cannot be taken as successful; the results that he asserts in his summary cannot be justified by the inscriptional evidence or by his method of analysis.

3. '*Revisiting Old Mataram*': an evaluation

'Revisiting Old Mataram' represents the first English language attempt to use the detailed chronological information presented in the inscription of Wanua Tengah III for a sustained

reconstruction of the dynastic relationships in the arena of Central and East Java²². Wisseman-Christie (p. 32) summarizes the importance of the document in that it adds some unknown names to the kinglist, 'bring[s] some shadowy peripheral figures into the light', sorts out the chronology of the kings, helps 'to assess the validity of the division between the "Sañjaya" and "Śailendra" rulers, and to appreciate the turbulence of Mataram's history at various times'. Like Kusen's, the research efforts of Wisseman-Christie fundamentally conclude that ancient Central Java was administered by a single line of kings- that the famous Śailendra kings were incorporated into the kingships denominated by the Wanua Tengah III inscription. How well these claims as presented by Wisseman-Christie stand up to scrutiny will be examined below.

Accommodating ROM to the chronological structure suggested by the inscription of Wanua Tengah III which serves as its historical backbone, Wisseman-Christie has organized her essay temporally but divided it into five conceptual periods for the reader's benefit, each period being accorded its own theme. The divisions between periods were chosen on the basis of accommodating the reigns of seemingly genealogically related kings and are seemingly terminated at what are taken by Wisseman-Christie as punctures of dynastic and political continuity, though the first demarcated period addresses the establishment of the Matarām kingdom by Sañjaya. The five phases are denoted as "Phase one: foundation (A.D. 716-746)", "Phase two: expansion and consolidation in Central Java (A.D. 746-827)", "Phase three: new directions and eastward expansion (A.D. 828-885)", "Phase four: political turbulence (A.D. 885-898)", and "Balitung and the first years of phase five: stabilization and growing East Javanese influence (A.D. 898-910)". This critique will adapt itself to the five-phase structure.

As a preface to her essay, Wisseman-Christie helpfully establishes the raw historical framework with a translation into English of selected pertinent passages of the inscription of Wanua Tengah III. It is regrettable that despite the elaborate expansion, translation and annotation of the calendrical abbreviations from Old Javanese²³ that she, like Kusen, has presented consistently mis-synthesized Julian dates from the Javanese data²⁴.

²² Contrary to Wisseman-Christie's assertion (p. 29) that the Wanua Tengah III kinglist has made little impact outside of Java, the information in the Wanua Tengah III kinglist has been used in a substantive manner by Jordaan (1993, 1996, 1999) and Miksic *et al* (1996).

²³ Several of her translations and expansions of abbreviations stand in error. The errors occurring in Wisseman-Christie's translation of Wanua Tengah III are as follows: '*Wurukung*' of 749 Śaka must be read as '*Wās*'; the Sanskrit word '*dvitiya*' from the entry for 750 Śaka should be translated into English as 2nd and not 12th'; '*Angara*' from both 750 Śaka and 768 Śaka must be altered to '*Aditya*'; in the 816 Śaka entry there is no need for the brackets Wisseman-Christie placed around '*sira*'; the word needs no supplementation as it is spelled out fully in the inscription.

²⁴ From this miscalculation, Wisseman-Christie later asserts that *dyah* Gula occupied the throne for less than six months and was deposed in a coup, when in fact Gula was there for over a year and a half.

In addition to objecting to Wisseman-Christie's expansion and transformation of Javanese calendrical information in the inscription of Wanua Tengah III, we must also be wary of certain items of the vocabulary employed to translate the Old Javanese passages. The Old Javanese word '*rahyanta*' as used by Balitung pops up twice in the essay. The first clause of the Wanua Tengah III inscription was translated by Wisseman-Christie as 'It was he, known as the holy ancestor of Hāra, younger brother of the holy ancestor of Mḍaṅ, who founded the Buddhist monastery at Pikatan as a permanent sign [of his piety]'. The cognate term '*rahyanta rumuhun*'²⁵ from the inscription of Mantyaṣiḥ (lines B7-8) is conveyed to Wisseman-Christie's English-speaking readership as denoting 'ancestor spirits of the past'. These translations are contentious because of the use of 'ancestor'; the Old Javanese word itself is compounded from the Sanskrit '*hyang*', or gods, prefixed with the honorific particle '*ra*'. Much more appropriate is Sarkar's translation (1970, vol. 2: 75) as 'deified beings of earlier times', as the notion of the enumerated kings being direct genealogical predecessors of Balitung is not thereby implied.

In her last general note before beginning the chore of the actual reconstruction of the kings of ancient Central Java, Wisseman-Christie (p. 28) notes that the multiplicity of royal names- even of royal consecration names- compounds the difficulty of 'assembling a coherent list of rulers of early Matarām' and in fact is the 'major problem' in doing so; I tend very much to agree with her on this issue. She notes that royal names had several components, most being preceded by the title *śrī mahārāja*, followed 'usually' by their *watak* (apanage) title of *rake* or *rakai* (which she says in its unabbreviated form was '*rak [a] r [a] yān i*' followed by the title of the *watak*. She continues on to note that 'Those rulers who had been ceremonially installed on the throne were also given a lengthy Sanskrit *abhiṣeka* (consecration) name, usually preceded by the epithet *śrī*. Some rulers appear to have more than one *abhiṣeka* name, which were used under different circumstances.' She cites the differing names given for Balitung between the Mantyaṣiḥ and Wanua Tengah III inscriptions, two inscriptions which differ in time only by a year: Mantyaṣiḥ terms Balitung as *śrī mahārāja rakai Watukura dyaḥ Balitung śrī Dharmmodāya Mahāśambu*, while in Wanua Tengah III he is called *śrī mahārāja rake Watukura dyaḥ Balitung śrī Īśwarakeśawsamarottungga Rudramūrti*²⁶. She summarizes: 'This complexity and mutability of royal names, and the fact that different portions of these names might be used in different inscriptions, inevitably creates confusion and adds to the difficulties involved in establishing a workable list of rulers and their dates.' This conclusion seems perfectly sound- at present we know a few of the personal names and none of the coronation names of the early kings listed in the Wanua Tengah inscription.

Wisseman-Christie begins a new paragraph on the posthumous names of kings, calling their locational epithets 'apotheosis names', and noting that Warak became *Śrī mahārāja sang lumāḥ i kelāsa*, and that Kayuwangi *dyaḥ Lokapāla* appears to have become the *śrī mahārāja* or *dewata*

²⁵ Registry of '*rumuhun*' is surprisingly absent from the normally comprehensive Damais (1970:224), which notes only Bulai C's use of this term.

²⁶ The topic of Balitung's names is taken up in greater detail in Nastiti 1996.

whose ashes were interred at Pāstika, other deceased rulers being even more difficult to identify after death. We may object to the use of the term 'apotheosis name', as there is a clear intention of sacralization but no clear indication of divinization inherent in the epithet; it could be translated as 'the holy *mahārāja* lying at X'.

3a. "Phase one: foundation (A.D. 716-746)": an evaluation

Wisseman-Christie begins the first portion of her five- phase reconstruction, consisting of "Phase one: foundation (A.D. 716-746)", which is devoted almost entirely to the figure of the dynastic progenitor Sañjaya.

Wisseman-Christie (p. 32) equates *Ratu Sañjaya* (reigned A.D. 716-746?) to 'the holy ancestor of Mḍaṅ' of Wanua Tengah III, and then clarifies that Sañjaya mounted the throne in 716. She states that there are only three inscriptions dating to the Sañjaya era: Taji Gunung, Timbanan Wungkal, and the 'recently discovered' Tihang inscription for which she cites Boechari (n.d.), an inscription which she implies is helpfully cross-dated in both Śaka and Sañjaya eras. To this list we must add an overlooked fourth inscription, Tulang Er, which also bears cross-dating (see Santosa 1994: 186-190).

Wisseman-Christie notes that Sañjaya's status as founder of Matarām first arose in the time of Kayuwangi but fails to denote exactly which inscription mentions Sañjaya. She also believes that Kayuwangi was 'the first to incorporate into his documents generalized invocations of ancestor kings for the protection of the palace', a 'trend' that appears to have begun around 880 A.D., a time she notes as a 'time of strife and intrigue around the palace, reflected by the Wuatan Tija inscription'. I point out that the original of the Pupus inscription (copied in 1022 Śaka but doubtlessly derived from an earlier inscription) contains a grant made near Semarang to a religious foundation 'belonging to the descendents of the holy ancestor Sañjaya'. The triple facts of Kayuwangi's devotion, Balitung's use of Sañjaya as the dynastic capstone in *both* [italics mine; W.-C.'s statement stands in error for Wanua Tengah III] Mantyāsiḥ and Wanua Tengah III, as well as the Sañjaya dating of Dakṣa, all suggest to W.-C. 'that Sañjaya had acquired particular importance as a unifying ancestor figure during times of political stress'. W.-C. fails to note here that Wanua Tengah III seemingly mentions Sañjaya (under the rubric of '*rahyangta i Mḍaṅ*') only because his relative founded the monastery in question, and furthermore that the memory of Sañjaya was seemingly dormant for a century or more - our evidence is limited as we know next to nothing about the regencies of any of the early kings- after his death and is revived only at a much later time.

ROM (p. 33) notes that Sañjaya and his father Sanna or Sannaha employed the 'modest' title of '*rāja*' and that Mantyāsiḥ calls Sañjaya '*rake Matarām sang ratu Sañjaya*', which implies to her that the kingdom was not very large and may have consisted of Keḍu only, bounded by the mountains Prahū, Sendoro, Sumbing, Ungaran, Merbabu, and Merapi. This speculation raises the obvious question: why in a document which calls upon a line of kings capped with Sañjaya would they not at

least honor their kingdom's founder with a suitably powerful title rather than one which is degraded with respect to his successors? Luckily for modern scholarship, several of the published works of Damais address themselves to exactly the topic at hand: the value of the Old Javanese title of *'ratu'*. In his 'Epigrafisch Aantekening', Damais (1949: 18-20) apprised the scholarly world of the fact that Kayuwangi, after seven successive years of calling himself *'śrī mahārāja'* in his inscriptions, employed the title of *'ratu'* in the inscription of Pěᅇdem, then reverted to his *'śrī mahārāja'* title. This, together with the alternance of the title of Rakai Pikatan between the inscriptions of Tulang Er and his dedication graffiti on the votive shrines at Plaosan, was sufficient proof for Damais to conclude that the titles of *ratu* and *śrī mahārāja* carried a hierarchical equivalency; one was not subordinate to the other. In his own inscription at Gunung Wukir, Sañjaya terms himself a *'rāja'*; the addition of the superlative prefix *'mahā'* is free for the asking if you yourself are commissioning the inscription. As titles are cheap, why indeed would Sañjaya himself not deem himself a *'śrī mahārāja'*, or even better yet, the *'adirājarāja'* of the last line of the Plaosan inscription? Would his titular pretensions be overruled by his lapicide? Concerning the breadth of territory dominated by Sañjaya, it is necessary to note that the inscription of Taji Gunung, seemingly found south of Prambanan and issued during the time of Dakᅇa, records that the *sīma* was set up on the site of a former campground of Sañjaya²⁷, thus suggesting that his kingdom extended beyond Keᅇu to include at least the plains of Prambanan as well. The Pupus copper-plate inscription (copied in 1022; original date illegible) seems to indicate that Sañjaya held power not only in Keᅇu and Prambanan but as far north as Semarang. We must therefore reject W.-C.'s assertion that the Mantyaᅇsiᅇ list 'accords all of [Sañjaya's] successors the grander Sanskrit title of "*Śrī Mahārāja*"', and furthermore note that all of these data cohere to suggest that the kingdom of Matarām during the period of Sañjaya was considerably more expansive than assumed by W.-C. on the basis of the Old Javanese title assigned to him by Balitung two centuries after his reign.

Wissemann-Christie suggests that the first line of Wanua Tengah III could be interpreted as referring to the foundation of a monastery not by Sañjaya's younger brother, but rather the subordinate 'brother' king of the state known to the Chinese as 'Ho-ling', a king 'whose capital had been at Hāra, and whose territory had incorporated the Pikatan area until his state was annexed by Sañjaya. This Buddhist ruler may have belonged to the Śailendra family. If so, then the two royal families must have merged in the mid-eighth century, when Heling's annexation and subordination was reinforced by a marriage tie between Sañjaya and a woman related to Heling's ruler'. Before commenting on her speculation, it must be first noted that the word *'aw'*, used to relate the two figures of Mᅇaᅇ and Hāra, is almost never found in Javanese inscriptions: Damais 1970:104 records only three instances of *'aw'* from Javanese inscriptions, all of which provide contexts too ambiguous to ascertain a meaning for the word. Zoetmulder's Old Javanese-English Dictionary provides a primary meaning of 'younger brother', but with secondary meanings of 'close relative'; the designated person of Hara could therefore possibly be the sister mentioned in Canggal, another person unknown to us,

²⁷ For more on this campground, see Sundberg 2003:17 n. 32.

or Rakai Panangkaran himself. Directing ourselves against W.-C.'s speculation on the role of 'Ho-ling', we can pose numerous objections: 1) why did the name of Ho-ling persist from the 660's until 820, at which time the name of the Javanese embassy was changed to Che-p'o, if Ho-ling had indeed been subsumed a century earlier? It would be, minimally, honest to inform the reader that Ho-ling regularly persisted as the domain name in the Chinese chronicles until 820, with a stray reference to Ho-ling in the 870's. This reluctance to acknowledge difficulties posed by foreign sources perhaps accounts for a remark included in the beginning of the essay, where W.-C. (p. 25) wrote: "Surviving foreign records are erratic in content, unevenly distributed in time, and frequently incorporate passages lifted from earlier sources." 2) Why if Sañjaya subordinated the Śailendras did the Śailendra name appear so luminously a half-century after Sañjaya's death? Furthermore, if their father was not a Śailendra but Sañjaya, why did the rulers of the late eighth century go to such pains to proclaim themselves members of their mother's supposedly defeated and subordinate dynasty? 3) What is the relationship, the existence of which was argued strongly by Damais, between the Chinese phoneme 'Holing' and the territory denoted in the original Javanese inscriptions as Walaing, possibly existing on the Ratu Baka hill itself (see De Casparis, 1956:256)? This is left unmentioned by W.-C. 4) Why should this allegedly defeated ruler be called a 'younger brother' in a historical document of 150 years later? 5) As a side note, does not the marital coup suggested by W.-C.- a conquest or merger by Sañjaya with a dynasty which had not only an impressively Sanskrit name but also diplomatic recognition by the imperial court of China- negate her previous suggestion that the realm of Sañjaya was small and possibly in control of no more than the Keḍu?

In the next phase of the essay, Wisseman-Christie (p. 34) unfortunately presents her speculation of Sañjaya's assumption of control over Ho-ling as an established fact: 'One of the results of Mataram's intercourse with, and incorporation of, the neighboring cosmopolitan coastal trading state of Heling was the exposure of its rulers to Heling's long-standing and sophisticated connections with the international Buddhist community. This religious influence became more marked during the second phase of Mataram's history, the period between A.D. 746 and 828, encompassing the reigns of four kings'. One wishes that fact and speculation were clearly distinguished, and that hypotheses did not use previous speculations to stand on for support.

As a final remark on her treatment of the time of Sañjaya, Wisseman-Christie (p. 33) asserts that as many as three surviving inscriptions may have been issued during Sañjaya's reign. The author of this review is cognizant of only the well-known inscription of Canggal which can be conclusively dated to this period, but would be delighted to stand corrected.

3b. "Phase two: expansion and consolidation in Central Java (A.D. 746-827)": an evaluation

Wisseman-Christie provides a summary of her understanding of this period in a paragraph on page 39: she notes that the period that she terms 'Phase two' was marked by 'internally-peaceful and lengthy reigns that had succeeded each other in a regular manner over the period of a century. This long period of domestic stability during Mataram's second phase, which had underpinned a massive

temple-building programme, had also apparently coincided with a period of active naval aggression in Southeast Asian waters'.

It is here that ROM takes up the highly tendentious issue of the character and identity of the Śailendra dynasty. As we shall see, the treatment of this phase of Javanese history is so fundamentally flawed that it cannot be accepted in even its roughest form.

To aid the reader in comprehending the body of epigraphical information which derives from within the regnal period of the early Wanua Tengah III kings, I provide the following list of inscriptions, dates, languages, and royal figures and dynasties mentioned:

Panangkaran (746-784):

- Implicitly, the sīma foundation recorded in Wanua Tengah III, date unknown. Language unknown but likely Sanskrit. Royal names: Panangkaran.
- The sīma inscription of Bhānu (750). Sanskrit. No royal name?
- The dharmma foundation of a female merchant (771)²⁸. Sanskrit. Contents largely unknown.
- The building of the Tārā temple at Kālāsa by Panangkaran (778). Sanskrit. Royal names: Panangkaran, Śailendra mahārāja. Śailendra dynasty explicitly mentioned.
- The consecration of an image of Mañjuśrī at Kēlurak (782). Sanskrit. Royal name: Śrī Sangramadhananjaya. Śailendra dynasty explicitly mentioned.

Panaraban/Panunggalan (784-803):

- Implicitly, control over the lands at Wanua Tengah. Language unknown. Royal name: Panaraban
- The vajra-mantra from Ratu Baka. Language Sanskrit. Royal name: Panarabwan.
- The inscription of Mañjuśrīgṛha (792). Old Malay. No explicit royal name?

²⁸ See Barrett-Jones (1984:111 n. 10) for the only published information on this inscription. Boechari described to Barrett-Jones (Barrett-Jones, 1984: 111 n. 10) the finding of an inscription near Boyolali which records the 771 A.D. foundation of a '*dharmma*' by a female merchant. Such an inscription would add tremendously to our understanding of early Javanese Buddhism, but it has apparently gone missing without a trace despite my best efforts to track it down [private communications with Djoko Dwiyanto, Niniek Soesanti, and Jan Wisseman-Christie]. I suspect that it was among a group of epigraphic material which was systematically stolen in the late 1970's or early 1980's.

- The inscription of Abhayagirivihāra (792-793). Sanskrit. Royal names: Samaratuṅga²⁹. Śailendra dynasty explicitly mentioned.

Warak: (803-828)

- Implicitly, control over the lands at Wanua Tengah. Language unknown. Royal name: *Rake Warak dyaḥ* Manara.
- Muṅḍuan (807)³⁰ Old Javanese. No royal name.
- Garung (819). Old Javanese. No royal name.
- Kamalagi (821). Old Javanese. No royal name.
- Hujung (822). Old Javanese. No royal name.
- Kayumwungan (824). Sanskrit verse with Old Javanese administrative section. Royal names: Samaratuṅga, Pramodavarddhanī. Śailendra dynasty probably mentioned.
- Abhayānanda (826). Old Javanese. No royal name.

Wisseman-Christie notes (p. 34) that the Śailendras are mentioned in several ornamental passages of Sanskrit prose, but receive mention in 'none of the more prosaic inscriptions or parts of inscriptions, written either in Old Javanese or in a coastal dialect similar to Old Malay³¹, mention this

²⁹ Wisseman-Christie, basing her information on de Casparis' (1950:11-23) publication of the museum fragments of the Abhayagirivihāra inscription, included the name of Dharmatuṅgadeva as the regent named in this inscription. By the 1961 publication of the portions of the newer-found fragments and continuing to his 1990 essay on the historical background of Borobudur, de Casparis began asserting the name of the regent to be Samaratuṅga, with Dharmatuṅgadeva dropping out of the picture. After personal inspection of all portions of the Abhayagirivihāra inscription, I have concluded that de Casparis' 1961 information on Samaratuṅga was not a new epigraphic datum from the new fragments, but rather was a tacit amendment of his 1950 reading of 'Dharmatuṅgadeva'. This idea is reinforced by his 1990 writings on the Śailendras, where he writes (p. 14) '... the author believes that the epigraphic data suggest that the major part of central Java was ruled by the Sailendras (and most of the time by one king, Samaratunga c. 792-824), whereas descendants of Sanjaya controlled the north coast and the mountainous areas, but under Sailendra supremacy'. Based on personal inspection, I tend to support de Casparis' amended reading, though with reservations as I had neither truly adequate light nor van Gulik's (1958) useful tables of Siddham characters at my disposal when making my observations. The Abhayagirivihāra inscription should be among the foremost of the inscriptions documented with the modern technical means I suggested in Sundberg (2006b). For more on the Abhayagirivihāra, the importance of the Sinhalese monks there, and the peculiarities of the Siddham script used in Java and China, see Sundberg (2004).

³⁰ Oemar (1970) misread one of the ciphers on the stone. I reduce the true date to 21 January, 807, a date for which the cyclical and lunar calendrical information firmly coincide: 'Ha U Wṛ' is the 110th day of a cycle which began on 4 October 806, which coincides with the 8th day after the full moon of 12 January, 807. I intend to publish a study of this inscription, the oldest known Javanese language inscription of Central Java, at a later date.

³¹ There is an unwarranted insistence on the part of Wisseman-Christie to qualify the Old Malay language inscriptions found in Java as being a 'northern coastal dialect'. This is pure speculation and

family name. They focus instead on a different set of titles and names, suggesting that the terms by which the same set of rulers were identified differed with the context, language, authorship, and expected audience of a particular inscription or portion of an inscription.' This seems perfectly reasonable, but W.-C. unfortunately does not provide the reader with any indication of the size of the data set available to present-day scholarship, the remarkably small size of which itself could be construed to indicate that all the Śailendra *sīma* provisions were rescinded when the Śailendras were expelled to Sumatra and their territory confiscated by the 'Sañjaya' kings. As may be noted in the table above, there are absolutely no royal administrative inscriptions extant from the reigns of Panangkaran, Panaraban, or Warak, with the exception of that information carried along in the foundation inscriptions of Kālasan, Abhayagirivihāra, and the implicit information in the legal history of the fields at Wanua Tengah.

ROM further notes (p. 34) that 'Although the few written remains surviving from this period are too ambiguous in content to resolve this question, the distribution of inscriptions of this period does not indicate that any clear territorial division of the state existed'. We must agree with this statement, which is an important consideration in any argument made for or against the two-dynasties thesis.

ROM then turns its attention to the relationship between those kings who called themselves 'Ornaments of the Śailendra Dynasty' and the kings chronologized in the inscription of Wanua Tengah III. In a mere sentence- one wishes that her argument were longer or the hypothesis more fully argued, as so many consequent assertions flow from it- Wisseman-Christie justifies her identification of Śailendra kings with those denominated in the Wanua Tengah III king-list (p. 35): "Moreover, if one accepts the dates provided by the Wanua Tengah III inscription, the reigns of the first three 'Sañjaya' family rulers of this phase appear to have coincided neatly with the dates assigned to the three 'Śailendra' rulers mentioned in Sanskrit inscriptions in Central Java." She acknowledges that there may have been initial separation between the ruling families of Matarām of the 'Sañjayas' and Heling of the Śailendras before their merger, then adds cryptically 'By the mid-eighth century, however, the division between rulers who have been assigned to the two families may already have been more apparent than real. If this was [sic] the case, then the dynastic diagram would contain fewer loose ends'.

The correspondences, seemingly provisional where they employ the mathematical symbols '=?', assigned between the Śailendra kings by Wisseman-Christie are as follows:

Rake Panangkaran *dyaḥ Pañcapana* [sic] =? 'Indra Sanggrāmadhanamjaya [sic] of A.D. 782

Rake Panunggalan = 'narendra Sāraṇa' of Mañjuśrīgrha =? Dharmmottunggadewa [sic] of Abhayagirivihāra =?

Wiṣṇu of Ligor.

Rake Warak *dyaḥ Manara* =? Samarattungga of 824.

Dyaḥ Gula = ? (no *abhiṣeka* name)

Bālaputra is posited as possibly the son of the ousted *dyaḥ Gula* of c. 860 A.D.

cannot be sustained by reference to any fact. Damais (1968:334, 469) himself notes with regard to a similar assertion by de Casparis that we cannot even determine if Old Malay was spoken by the inhabitants of present-day peninsular Malaysia.

I will pause for a moment and take stock of the identifications developed in ROM.

First, Panangkaran. With regard to the alleged 'Indra Sanggrāmadhanaṃjaya' [sic] of the Kēlurak inscription of A.D. 782, I note first and foremost that the two names out of which Wisseman-Christie has contrived her coronation name are widely separated on the lines of the stone: the word 'Indra' occurs on line 4 and the words 'Śrī Sanggrāmadhanaṃjaya' occur on lines 14-15; at the very least it would be bad practice to synthesize a name out of elements chiseled so far apart. Secondly, it is quite likely that the reading of 'Indranāmnā' is a misreading by Bosch; as De Casparis argued and Coèdes seemingly concurred³², the inscription of Kēlurak does not read *dharaṇīndranāmnā* but *dharaṇindharena* (Coèdes 1959: 48). De Casparis' reading of the second name is *śrī saṅgrāmadhanaṃjaya*. Finally, I find it unusual that Panangkaran should allegedly employ his territorial title in the very important inscription of Kalasan of 778, but use a consecration name in the inscription of Kēlurak of 782.

Rake Panunggalan is definitely equated with the '*narendra* Sāraṇa' of the 792 inscription of Mañjuśrīgr̥ha and provisionally equated with both Dharmmottunggadewa [sic] of Abhayagirivihāra and, seemingly more tentatively with the Wiṣṇu of Ligor, dated by Wisseman-Christie to 'after A.D. 775'. The identification labeled as '=' is merely possible but not more- one would like to see the proof that the term Sāraṇa is a personal name³³. The identifications labeled '=?' stand flatly in error. Within the 1961 essay by de Casparis on the presence of a world-class Sinhalese monastery on the Ratu Baka hill (the fact that this *Artibus Asiae* article is referenced in W.-C.'s bibliography but unused in her essay is disturbing) comes the hypothesis-shattering fact that the monastery was founded in 792 during the prospering reign of Samaratuṅga. To make the implication clear, de Casparis reports that his epigraphical researches throw forward the name of the Śailendra king Samaratuṅga in two inscriptions, Abhayagirivihāra of 792 and Kayumwungan of 824, which itself is *prima facie* evidence that the great Śailendra lord's reign spanned the reigns of both Panaraban and Warak: Samaratuṅga is clearly alive and reigning in 792.

ROM provisionally assigns *Rake Warak dyaḥ* Manara to Samaratuṅga of the 824 Kayumwungan inscription. As noted in the paragraph above, Samaratuṅga was already the Śailendra regent more than 10 years before Warak gained his throne. Based on the information due to de Casparis, we must categorically reject the equation of Warak with Samaratuṅga proposed by Wisseman-Christie.

³² Damais (1968: 354 n. 1) noted that de Casparis' *Prasasti Indonesia* expresses inconsistent and mutually incompatible views on this subject. Damais himself observed in numerous instances that de Casparis' work suffered from a lack of harmonization of views, conclusions, and interpretations from section to section, and was in need of at least one more revision before being put to press.

³³ I have prepared an extensive monograph on the Mañjuśrīgr̥ha inscription and will treat this word in deeper detail there.

Dyaḥ Gula is denoted as having no known *abhiṣeka* name (p. 35) and is imputed to have 'failed to hold on to the throne long enough to be ceremonially installed' (p. 38). As noted above in the examination of the dates of the Wanua Tengah inscription, the assertion of an unnaturally brief reign is due to a miscalculation of the dates for the accession of Garung, who gained the throne on 14 February 829 rather than the 24 January 828 as reported by both Wisseman-Christie and Kusen. *Dyaḥ* Gula sat on the throne for more than 1 1/2 years, and furthermore implicitly had some say in the disposition of the crown lands at Wanua Tengah. In this regard, it is also notable that even *dyaḥ* Tagwas (reigned February-October, 885) seems on independent evidence to have carried both a royal and territorial title³⁴ despite not being accorded a royal title in his mention in Wanua Tengah III; we have no reason to suspect that Gula did not also carry a territorial title. While ROM asserts that Gula had no *abhiṣeka* name, the descendance of Śrī Bālaputradeva from Gula as hypothesized by Wisseman-Christie implicitly obligates the assignment of an *abhiṣeka* name to Gula. The evidence from the Nālandā copperplate of Devapāladeva, referenced in the bibliography but unfortunately not employed in the reconstruction, clearly shows that the king Bālaputradeva was sired by Samarāgravīra³⁵, himself the son of a king known by his epithet as a 'killer of proud enemies'. The implications of Nālandā are that, following W.-C.'s provisional assignments, *dyaḥ* Gula did indeed bear the coronation name of Samarāgravīra and therefore that it was Warak who must have been the 'killer of proud enemies'³⁶. Examination of the epigraphical evidence causes me to very much doubt W.-C.'s assignments. The Nālandā inscription offers elaborate praise of the greatness and warlike prowess accorded to Samarāgravīra, the royal father of Bālaputradeva, which is not consistent with the fact that *dyaḥ* Gula lasted only one and a half years on the throne³⁷, and furthermore that other

³⁴ Aside from the inscription of Wanua Tengah III, the name *Dyaḥ* Tagwas is found in the fragmented copperplate inscription of Er Hangat, found near Banyumas to the south of the Dieng plateau. In this inscription he calls himself *Mahārāja Dyaḥ* Tagwas Śrī Jayakirtiwarddhana, alternately giving his personal name as *Dyaḥ* Gwas.

³⁵ This information will not be found in the initial translation of the inscription in the article by Shastri (1924) cited in ROM's bibliography although the words are clearly there in line 56, with an alternate reading of 'Samarāgradhaira' (Shastri 1924:323 n. 4). Krom was the first to recognize Samarāgravīra as a proper name (Damais 1968:364).

³⁶ I personally do not accept this and offer these assignments merely to illustrate the full implications of Wisseman-Christie's hypothesis.

³⁷ If we accept Wisseman-Christie's equation, then the following passages from the inscription of Nālandā must pertain to *dyaḥ* Gula, whose name possibly translates as 'Prince[ss] Sugar': '[Samarāgravīra] possessed prudence, prowess, and good conduct, whose two feet fondled too much with hundreds of diadems of mighty kings (bowing down)... his fame was equal to that earned by Yudhiṣṭhira, Parāśara, Bhīmasena, Karṇṇa and Arjuna... By the continuous existence of whose fame the world was altogether without the dark fortnight, just like the family of the lord of the *daityas* (demons) was without the partisanship of Kṛṣṇa.' [Shastri 1924:326].

inscriptions referring to Śailendra kings carrying epithets denoting variants of 'killer of proud enemies' come from the inscriptions of Ligor (c. 775?) and Kēlurak (782), both of which are too early to apply to the case of Warak but seem to be much more suited to the era of Panangkaran. I doubt very much that these necessary implications were intended to be invoked by W.-C..

As a final note on the efforts of Wisseman-Christie to equate Śailendra with Sañjaya, we see that the analytical apparatus used to justify their equation- that 'the reigns of the first three 'Sanjaya' family rulers of this phase appear to have coincided neatly with the dates assigned to the three 'Śailendra' rulers mentioned in Sanskrit inscriptions in Central Java' (p. 34-35), has proven unequal to the task and indeed should never have been made if W.-C. had actually consulted the references she cited. Certainly we should wish that future researchers employ a more rigorous methodology if they wish to identify the kings of the Śailendra dynasty with the kings enumerated in the Wanua Tengah III history. Even taking the method of apparent chronological correspondence on its own, we are seemingly inundated with Śailendra names for which correspondence must be found with the kings enumerated in the king list of Wanua Tengah III. Of the known or suspected names of Śailendra kings, (I list Viṣṇu and Śrī Mahārāja of Ligor, Śrī Saṅgrāmadhanamjaya of Kelurak, Samaratuṅga of Abhayagirivihāra and Kayumwungan, Samarāgravīra and Bālaputradeva of Nālandā, Bhujayatuṅga of Plaosan, and Jitendra³⁸), how can we make them accord to all the names of the Wanua Tengah kings, and how can we resolve the troubling question of how blood participation in the glorious Śailendra dynasty became something that the kings of Java claimed no longer?

Wisseman-Christie asserts that Matarām rapidly assumed a place in the world, becoming 'a major player in the arena of Asian sea trade, capitalizing on Heling's long-established position in regional and long-distance trading networks'. It is not clear how W.-C. envisions Java only becoming commercially important after the rise of the Matarām kingdom if the economic apparatus had already existed under the domain of Heling.

The Chinese inscriptions mention the eastward shift of the Javanese [sic: the Chinese chronicles say 'Ho-ling', while ROM says 'Java' without proving that one is identical to the other or even acknowledging that this is a minor scholarly issue] capital between the years of 742-755. ROM asserts that 'The distribution of inscriptions ascribed to rake Panangkaran's reign confirms this eastward shift' but fails to mention the number of inscriptions which are so ascribed; the answer is seemingly two, the Hampran inscription from Salatiga and the mysterious 771 dharmma inscription from near Boyolali. Both inscriptions do originate from c. 40 miles to the north of Canggal so there is indeed a slight geographic shift in the (non-royal) inscriptions to the east, though this says nothing about the location of the *kraton*. She cites the 750 A.D.³⁹ *sīma* charter of Hampran from Salatiga as evidence that the 'state's reach had been extended towards the northeast along the coast'. Wisseman-Christie also believes that Matarām was expanding to the southeast from Keḍu, into the

³⁸ For this rarely acknowledged mention of a Śailendra king, see Lokesh Chandra (1995: 217).

³⁹ In addition to the reference citation provided, it is clear that Wisseman-Christie has used the work of Damais 1970:43 n. 2 to correct to 750 the defective reading of '752' proposed by de Casparis.

plains of Prambanan; evidence discussed above shows that Sañjaya had already made a camp as far east as Prambanan and the Ratu Baka plateau.

Interspersed throughout the narrative of the dynastic history of the kings of Matarām, bits and pieces of an architectural reconstruction occur. The subject seems germane to the topic of the political history of the Javanese kingdoms, for temple-building seemed to be the preeminent activity of Javanese kings and might serve as a gauge of their religious preferences.

As a side-note, seemingly unrelated to the theme of her paragraph, there is mention of the Boechari-inspired notion that the Sewu temple was immediately enlarged upon its 782 construction. While not exactly germane to a history of the kings of Java, the purpose of the review at hand, it should be noted that this conclusion of a 792 A.D. expansion has been falsified by my recent researches (Sundberg 2006a) into the stone of Mañjuśrīgrha, alleged by a reading of Boechari to mention the expansion ('*mawṛddhi*' on line 2) of the temple. This reading of Boechari is flatly impossible; the inscription does not mention the expansion of the Sewu temple complex⁴⁰.

ROM (p. 37) mentions that Plaosan 'appears to have been under construction by the 790's', citing de Casparis 1956:175-206, his chapter on the immense *Siddhamātrkā* inscription found in front of the Plaosan Lor temple. Unfortunately, the opinion of de Casparis expressed in that chapter does not in any way support the date of 790, de Casparis (1956:178) himself writing: '... the most probable date of the Plaosan inscription would be before the middle of the 9th century A.D. Unfortunately neither a definite date, nor even the name of the reigning king could be traced in the text of the inscription'⁴¹.

Wisseman-Christie believes that based on the surviving inscriptions from Warak's time, Warak controlled a wider area than his predecessors; she believes that his domain covered the territory from Dieng to Prambanan and northeast to Solo, without informing the reader that his name appears not once in the extant corpus of inscriptions. It seems that following this line of reasoning, all inscriptions that are found in Central Java must derive from the Matarām kingdom whether or not they contain the name of a Wanua Tengah III king, even though her article envisions a relentless expansion of the kingdom, annexation of neighboring kingdoms, and absorption of defeated royal houses into the ranks of the court nobility under the power of the kings of Matarām. The literacy uniquely attributed to Matarām is difficult to sustain in light of the fact that independent kingdoms are known to have existed around the Eastern Javanese city of Malang. Implicit in the description of the kingdom of Matarām stretching from Dieng to Solo is the use of the Hanasima inscription from Dieng. Although it is included in the Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java (Sarkar 1970 vol. 1:49-52) with a date

⁴⁰ I communicated this fact to Wisseman-Christie in an e-mail dated 25 March, 2001, but apparently the information arrived too late to amend the essay as published.

⁴¹ It is curious too that Wisseman-Christie should represent the Plaosan inscription as mentioning *monks* from Gurjara; no such *monks* are mentioned in the passage regarding arrivals from Gurjara (De Casparis 1956:195).

of 809 A.D., Damais believes it is impossible to read the date as such. The earliest confirmed Dieng inscription known to this writer is the 854 inscription of Wayuku.

ROM asserts that 'most inscriptions issued during rake Warak's reign appear to have been *sīma* - or tax grant - charters, initiated by or with the approval of the ruler, usually for the benefit of religious foundations.' Unfortunately, Wisseman-Christie does not inform the reader of the very small number of inscriptions actually obtained from the period of Warak's reign, nor that not a single one of them connotes the imprimatur of Warak as king, though the language of Pengging (819) does imply an unnamed royal donor. W.-C. asserts that a number of Hindu foundations obtained endowments under Warak, an assertion seemingly without firm evidence but not impossible to envisage. However, she believes that most preference was given to Buddhist establishments, 'confirmed by rake Warak's eventual use of the Buddhist temple of Kalasan as funerary temple'. To this hypothesis we must note that it is an unfortunately ungrounded attribution on W.-C.'s part if she believes that Kelaśa or Kailaśa can be equated to Kālasan, especially given that the existence of Kailaśa as an Old Javanese toponym has been verified from the area around present-day Wonosobo⁴². Finally, W.-C. hypothesizes that 'the wording of the passage may suggest a perceived link between his death and this unmeritorious act': this is unlikely because no such implication is later carried with regard to Pikatan, who also retracted the *sīma* rights for the *vihāra* at Pikatan.

3c. "Phase three: new directions and eastward expansion (A.D. 828-885)": an evaluation

ROM hypothesizes that Garung may have toppled Gula in a coup and furthermore points out that the inclusion of a posthumous designation for Garung's father (Garung was named as the person whose father's ashes were interred at Tūk⁴³) seems designed to call attention to his extraordinary succession to the throne. I personally am inclined to agree with Wisseman-Christie on the latter point, but wish to point out that it is entirely possible that no unannounced irregularity occurred: no known dynastical fact is violated in an assignment of Gula as the king interred at Tūk and thus the father of Garung. The fact that the inscription of Wanua Tengah unashamedly records three kings in the 880's who were explicitly forced from the throne lends support to the notion that Gula was not deposed in a coup. It should be noted that Gula came at the tail end of a succession of remarkably long-lived kings- we need only glance at the situation of Prince Charles of the present British monarchy to

⁴² The meter in the inscription of Kalasan calls for a long; both the syllables 'kā' and 'kai' suit the meter. The form of the sibilant is the pure 's' and not the 'ś' required of the context for 'Kailaśa'. Damais (1968:392) notes that Kālasa was likely the Sanskrit form of the Old Javanese toponym 'Kaalas-an', the 'place of the wilderness' or more probably, the 'place of the uncultivated terrain'. This is distinct from 'Kailaśa', an obvious reference to the mountain of Shiva.

⁴³ The original reading in Kusen's transcription was 'Tluk', while Boechari read 'Tūk'. It is actually impossible to tell, as the scribe has tangled lines in an otherwise neatly written inscription. As the inscription later designates a toponym that is unambiguously spelled 'Tūk', I prefer this reading for the location of the interment of Garung's father.

approximate the age of Gula upon the death of Warak, and this in a tropical climate devoid of antibiotics and snakebite anti-venoms.

From the existence of the 819 tax-transfer made by this *rakryān* Garung, Wisseman-Christie surmises that Garung was a figure of some importance during the reign of Warak, explicitly suggesting that he may have been one of the king's brothers. She notes that Garung does not appear to be the designated successor of Warak. Furthermore Garung's appanage domain appears to W.-C. to have been a frontier one, given that the 819 inscription was found near Solo, which W.-C. believes to have been at the frontier of Matarām at that time. Here we have a new tangle of hypotheses, none of which really stand up to the light of day. First, it must be said that nothing, absolutely nothing, serves as evidence that Warak and Garung were brothers; the relationship is pure speculation which advances our understanding of the situation not even one bit⁴⁴. Second, it must be noted that 26 years separate the coronations of the two individuals, and furthermore that Garung lived and reigned for nearly 18 years after his coronation; on these chronological grounds alone we might suspect that Warak and Garung do not share the fraternal relationship hypothesized by W.-C. Third, if W.-C. wishes to attribute participation in the Śailendra dynasty to Warak, and as well Garung is said to be his brother, then certainly Garung is a Śailendra too. And yet, the very last that is heard of the Śailendra dynasty in Java is an inscription of 824 which commemorates the founding of several temples by a daughter of Samaratuṅga. If the Śailendra name was carried on for at least 23 years beyond the demise of an allegedly Śailendra Warak, why do we not hear of it?

Of the general tenor of this period, ROM notes (p. 39) that 'the number of inscriptions issued-recording royal and private grants to a range of large and small religious foundations- increased sharply after the middle of the century'. Would it not be safer to say that the number of *surviving* inscriptions increased sharply after the coronation of Kayuwangi? We know that both Warak and Pikatan revoked the *sīma* charter for the monastery at Pikatan, which implies that boundary stones of Panangkaran and Garung would be destroyed, and as well the Śivagrha stone carried traces of an expunged *Siddham* inscription on its back. Wisseman-Christie believes that this alleged increase may have occurred because of 'growing domestic affluence and associated desires to use that wealth to enhance status, uncertain trading conditions abroad during a period of instability in China and parts of Southeast Asia which may have led to a decline in opportunities to acquire status-enhancing imports; and possibly also some degree of domestic political instability or at least unease'. She notes that Matarām's territorial control expanded 'dramatically' after 850 to include the Brantas delta, and 'this expansion may have caused some political stress'. ROM unfortunately leaves unexplained both the nature of the alleged 'stress' incurred by the subsumption of the Brantas delta and the evidence for it. We note a probable paradox: the relationship between the rise in the number of *sīma* provisions and the 'uncertain' trading conditions abroad, thus domestic affluence and increasing international commercialization even despite disrupted trading prospects in the major economic partners.

⁴⁴ It is interesting that Kusen advanced a hypothesis suggesting exactly the same strange relationship.

Wissemann-Christie believes that Garung enhanced his position on the throne by restoring the Pikatan monastery's revoked *sīma* provisions [she asserts through the use of the plural that there was more than one revoked by Warak; the present inscriptional record allows us to say nothing of the matter though implicit evidence justifies her assertion as extremely likely] and by continuing the temple-building program of previous rulers. She believes (pp. 39-40) that paleographically Sajiwan and many of the smaller structures around Sewu are expected to date from Garung's reign (citing de Casparis 1950:113-115). Unfortunately, the cited references to de Casparis explicitly say that the Sewu style of writing is paleographically earlier than the style used at Plaosan and Sajiwan, and even earlier than the script used on the hidden foot of Borobudur.

Moving on to the reign of Pikatan, ROM construes Pikatan's establishment of a palace at Mḍaṅ in Mamrati as 'the first recorded change in Java's internal political climate', although she believes that both palaces lay in the environs of Prambanan⁴⁵. It is uncertain how W.-C. envisions the relocation of the *kraton* as representing a desire to 'deal with political unease than respond to any locational inconvenience', and how moving the *kaḍatwan* a short distance could calm political tensions other than calling it a 'fresh-start' solution.

In an examination of Pikatan's religious affiliations- significant in light of the known revocation of the *sīma* charter at Wanua Tengah as well as the construction of a large Śaiva monument at Prambanan- ROM (p. 40) repeats de Casparis' thesis-driven translation⁴⁶ of a passage from the Śivagrha inscription which implies that Pikatan's chief queen was a Buddhist even while Pikatan himself was a Śaiva. Jordaan (1999:88 n. 50) has recently reexamined the passage in question with the assistance of the Javanese philologist Willem van der Molen, and notes that the sentence in question must read "'He [the king] was *Maheśvara* to *īśvari*, the spouse of the hero', in which *Maheśvara* may have three distinct meanings, namely that the King was a 'Great Lord', a Śaiva, or even equated with Śiva himself. Obviously, the meaning of the designation *īśvari*, for his wife, should be changed correspondingly"⁴⁷.

A propos the revocation of *sīma* rights at Wanua Tengah, ROM (p. 40) suggests that 'Pikatan apparently [sic] revoked the *sīma* charter in his own *watak* of Pikatan, which had been restored by

⁴⁵ Without studying the issue of the location of Mamrati in greater detail, it seems possible that the mention in the 829 Sanskrit excerpt from Garung, quoted in the inscription of Wanua Tengah III, of *watak* Mamrati indicates that this palace lay somewhere around present-day Temanggung, rather far from the plains of Prambanan.

⁴⁶ De Casparis was attempting to support his speculation that Hindu Rakai Pikatan married the Buddhist Śailendra crown princess, known by her epithet Śrī Kahulunnan. The revised chronologies now show that it was Garung who held the special relationship with Kahulunnan, whoever that figure may be.

⁴⁷ This rectification of DeCasparis' translation was also taken up by Chandra (1995:232), who amended it to the more simple 'He was *Maheśvara* and the consort (*patni*) of this hero (*śura*) was *īśvarī*.

rake Garung only a few years earlier'. Here we must stop for a moment and note that the crown lands at Wanua Tengah cannot be proven to be under the control of the Raka of Pikatan although they lie in the *watak* of Pikatan; they seem from the beginning to exist in a royal portfolio independent of any *rakaship*, the Wanua Tengah lands merely benefited the monastery at Pikatan, and furthermore they were not 'apparently' but rather explicitly withdrawn by Pikatan, for whatever reason, at a minimum 17 years and at a maximum 25 years after being restored by Garung. Returning to Wisseman-Christie's narrative, she believes that Pikatan's action against the interests of the monastery at Pikatan does not reflect a general withdrawal of support for all Buddhist establishments, because the future king *Rakai* Pikatan *dyaḥ* Saladu, as the *Raka* of Gurunwangi, built two of the satellite votive shrines at Plaosan, structures that were begun before but completed after *dyaḥ* Saladu took the throne according to Wisseman-Christie who follows de Casparis' opinions in the matter. Furthermore, asserts W.-C. (p. 40), the reliefs at Borobudur were continued and an inscription of 854 'records his approval of a tax grant benefiting the Buddhist monastery of Abhayānanda...'. Against these apparent indicators of Pikatan's support for Buddhism as well as Śaivism, it is necessary to point out first that the dates associated with Borobudur are nowhere near to being fixed. (I myself have argued in Sundberg 2006a that the evidence suggests that Borobudur was finished sometime around 835.) Egregiously in error is the representation of the Abhayānanda inscription, which absolutely does not record Pikatan's approval of a tax grant for that monastery; *Rakai* Pikatan is not mentioned explicitly or even implicitly in the Abhayānanda inscription, not even in a customary formula to mark the time by recording that the inscription was issued during his kingship. Furthermore, the Abhayānanda monastery was originally provisioned with *sīma* to the north of Klaten no later than 826, during the period of Warak. One really wishes that W.-C. had paid much closer attention to her sources, most available in English and many in either Dutch or Indonesian translation. With regards to the indisputable existence of Pikatan's name on the inscription of Plaosan Lor's temples, we might raise the following objection: the existence of the name of *Rakai* Sirikan *pu* Sūryya from the Wanua Tengah III inscription as well as the very active involvement of Śrī Kahulunnan show that the smaller temples and stupas were seemingly built very early in the reign of Garung; it is unclear how much volition was expressed by the seemingly royal but yet uncrowned *Rakai* Gurunwangi *dyaḥ* Saladu in his contribution to the temple.

The narrative (p. 41) then takes up the issue raised by de Casparis' interpretations of the stone of Śivagrha, which is summarized thusly: 'Rake Pikatan appears to have faced a major threat from within the royal family towards the end of his reign. The metric memorial inscription of A.D. 856 from Prambanan alludes to a military confrontation at the village of Iwung between two princes: rake Pikatan and a relative named Bālaputra. Rake Pikatan succeeded, with some difficulty, in suppressing an attempted overthrow by his rival not long before his death in A.D. 855. Bālaputra, who may have been a son of *dyaḥ* Gula, is quite possibly the same Bālaputra who was mentioned about five years later in the Nālandā inscription of Northeast India. This latter Bālaputra is identified in the inscription as a devout Buddhist, the ruler of a state in Sumatra, who was the grandson of an important Javanese ruler (probably *rake* Warak) of the Śailendra dynasty.' It is difficult to know where

to begin in deconstructing the errors and unprovables bundled up in this paragraph, almost none of which should be accepted in a proper history without much greater research and justification, as de Casparis' original errors and unwarranted translation are embellished by supplemental speculations by W.-C. I might begin by directing the reader to the well-justified criticisms of de Casparis' highly tendentious translation by Damais (1968:473-494) or Chandra (1995:232-233), who summarizes that 'Casparis connects stray elements [of the inscription], arisen out of doubtful readings, into a connected narrative'. It will also be useful to the reader to consider the progress reported in Jordaan 2000 in revising the chronology of the historical Bālaputradeva (who may or may not be mentioned under the name 'Walaputra' in the inscription of Śīvagṛha- it is simply impossible to know⁴⁸)- it is now clear that the date for the 35th regnal year of Devapāladeva must be shorn of at least a decade and possibly many more from the 860 date suggested by de Casparis and repeated in 'ROM'. *A propos* the suggestion that Balaputra was the vengeful son of *dyaḥ* Gula, the reader may consult the discussion of the topic as given several pages above which makes it clearly highly unlikely that Bālaputra was a child of Gula. On the topic of the allegedly devout Buddhism of the historical Bālaputradeva, the reader is urged to consult the material of Chandra (1995:233-234) which concludes that 'the comparison of [Bālaputradeva's] parents with Śailasutā (= Pārvati) and Śīva, and himself as their son Skanda is a clear indication of the explicit reverence of King Bālaputra towards Śāivism, and that too from his own inscription.' Finally, if W.-C. posits that the Śailendra are still in the Javanese political picture as late as 855, it is necessary to explain their position *vis-à-vis* Garung's documented activities on the Plains of Prambanan and in the hills of Temanggung, and furthermore the seeming extinction of their dynasty's name, especially in light of W.-C.'s speculation (p. 38) that Garung was one of Warak's brothers. The very unstable ground on which the original scholarly edifice was built, and the adjunction to de Casparis' original hypotheses and speculations by several more speculations original to W.-C., suggests that the reader must be very wary before accepting any of the material concerning her presentation of this topic.

ROM devotes a paragraph to the six Śāivite linga inscriptions erected on and around the Ratu Baka hill. Noting that Rake Walaing Pu Kumbhayoni was identified as the great-grandson of the Ratu of 'the former state of' Halu, Wisseman-Christie asserts without any proof whatsoever that 'Halu had been annexed by the expanding state of Mataram, probably in the middle of the eight century A.D., and this political annexation was apparently accompanied by a marriage alliance between the two ruling families'. She continues to observe that in the later ninth century Halu had become one of the

⁴⁸ In an effort to confirm de Casparis' readings, I examined the stone as it stands in its corner of the National Museum on multiple occasions. Although the days were bright to the point of being unbearable, I could not make out the required characters on the line in question. I have absolutely no proof of the legibility of the stone 50 years ago, before Jakarta's polluted rains took their toll on the stone, but urge the reader to attempt to confirm for himself or herself my claims that de Casparis's readings cannot be duplicated. This Plaosan inscription is a prime candidate for the modern scientific documentation methods I envisioned in Sundberg 2006b.

main *watak* titles of Matarām, 'usually held by a member of the king's immediate family'. It is unfortunate that W.-C. fails to even mention the probable identity, meticulously developed by Damais 1955, which equates 'Ho-ling' with the Walaing of Kumbhayoni's inscriptions, and the awkward consequences for W.-C.'s narrative.

Wisseman-Christie believes that Kumbhayoni claimed the throne of Matarām, but that 'this claim to the throne will be found to be ephemeral at best. That such a claim could have been advanced at this time, however, suggests that some turmoil followed in the wake of the struggle for the throne that took place in A.D. 855, and of Rake Pikatan's subsequent death', raising the question of how *Pu* Kumbhayoni had a right to erect seven inscriptions (the six *linga* inscriptions mentioned by W.-C. plus the 863 inscription of Pereng) ranging over a minimum of six years [856-863] on and around the Ratu Boko plateau, and furthermore how it came to be that the inscriptions of this so-called false claimant to the throne were allowed by the victorious claimant to remain in place until their removal to museums within this century. It is also a curious commentary on W.-C.'s methodology that if Kumbhayoni's name did not appear on the Wanua Tengah III list, then he cannot have been ruler of anything. That he ruled something is clear beyond all doubt; the word *rarāja* appears in the inscriptions with his name in the nominative case, and yet he never claimed the title of king for himself even though he was explicitly of royal blood⁴⁹. It is possible that W.-C.'s observation that Kumbhayoni's territory did not extend far, consisting of only 8 villages, but that Kumbhayoni appears to have made a 'military contribution' at a 'critical juncture' is the soundest summary encapsulation of the evidence.

ROM (p. 43) refers to a slow-down in trade in the last half of the 9th century, which apparently left Kayuwangi and successors with 'substantial agricultural surpluses to be disposed of'. She again refers to a 'combination of increased productivity and depressed overseas markets [which] provided the royal family with the opportunity to make generous provision for Matarām's religious foundations, and to be seen to be doing so on a large scale and with considerable pomp.' This alleged prosperity raises the question of why few if any new, great, expensive temples of the calibre of Sewu or Borobudur were built during this period; a better explanation might be that the kingdom of Matarām found outlets of cheap splendor in their ornaments and confirmation gifts, even while skimping on the costly construction projects of the magnitude of the golden days of the Śailendra.

ROM states that the subject of the 863 *sīma* grants of Wanua Tengah fields by Rakai Pikatan pu Manuku was the same Pikatan monastery as was benefacted by Panangkaran, and furthermore that Manuku's *sīma* grants were approved by Kayuwangi. Closer reading of this inscription shows that Kayuwangi did not approve Manuku's *sīma* grants but was merely noted in a chronological registry as regent at the time (his ministers were also identified); the *sīma* decision was Manuku's only. Furthermore, the monastery benefacted by Manuku was at Kasugihan⁵⁰ and not at Pikatan.

⁴⁹ Damais 1968:470

⁵⁰ I speculate that this was identical to the '*prāsāda kabikvan*' documented in the inscription of Sugih Manek (line A.7) of 915 A.D.

ROM (p. 44) begins a discussion of the tax transfers for the temples of Pāstika and Gunung Hyang, asserting seemingly without evidence that they were 'initiated by close relatives- probably either sons or brothers- who were potential successors to the throne'- I tend to agree with her on the grounds of the obvious care that Kayuwangi would take in entrusting important duties regarding the homage to the lineage. The first set began with the Polongan *sīma* foundations around Yogyakarta for, chiefly, the temple called Gunung Hyang (which Wisseman-Christie reasonably suggests may be the famous Śaiva temple at Prambanan), while a second set occurred around Magelang for other *prāsādas* at Upit, Kwāk, Landa, and above all Pāstika and its *bhaṭāra*. W.-C. (p. 44) hypothesizes that the funeral temple at Kwāk 'presumably contained the ashes of an ancestor shared by the ruler and *pu* Catura (possibly rake Garung) and the temple of Gunung Hyang - if it indeed was Loro Jonggrang - was also the abode of an ancestor, rake Pikatan. She further asserts that Kayuwangi was buried in the temple of Pāstika, though the 31 July, 881 date of the inscription of Pāstika showed that there was already a '*bhaṭāra*' installed there during the time before Kayuwangi died. As Kusen pointed out, we cannot be certain of the day of decease of rulers; Wanua Tengah III only commemorates the coronation of their successors. Kayuwangi is still recorded as alive as late as a 26 February, 883 inscription. It is entirely possible that it was the Raka of Pikatan who was interred at Pāstika.

3d. "Phase four: political turbulence (A.D. 885-898)": an evaluation

Because of the sudden late-reign emphasis on funerary temples, Wisseman-Christie hypothesizes (p. 45) that Kayuwangi needed to consolidate the status of his lineage and consequently of himself. W.-C. points out the evidence of threat to Kayuwangi was great in the last years of his reign, as evidenced by the Wuatan Tija inscription, which W.-C. interprets as the attempted kidnap of one of Kayuwangi's wives, *rakryān* Mānak (She translated: 'the mother of a child', though 'possessing a child' also accords with Old Javanese prefix usage.) along with the child *dyaḥ* Bhūmi by her younger brother *rakryān* Lanḍayan. ROM envisions that the tension and succession pressures arose thusly: 'Whether as a result of the internal stresses of an expanding state that was absorbing defeated royal lineages as it annexed smaller neighbors, or of the domestic strife experienced by a royal family lacking a strong tradition of primogeniture- and in which the ruler contracted multiple secondary marriages for strategic reasons- there do appear to have been rival contenders for the position as successor to rake Kayuwangi.' To this we must retort that there is no evidence that the state lacked a strong tradition of primogeniture, the possible hiccup with *dyaḥ* Gula notwithstanding: Pikatan seems connected to Garung as crown prince while Kayuwangi seems connected to Pikatan. The concern by Kayuwangi for the succession to his throne seems to internally contradict another hypothesis made earlier by W.-C. (p. 43), where she asserted that the Polengan and Ngabean series of *sīma* provisions were 'initiated by close relatives- probably either sons or brothers- who were potential successors to the throne.' Furthermore, *a propos* W.-C.'s recurrent assertion that Matarām incorporated 'defeated royal lineages' as new nobles in its court, rather than supplanting and eliminating them: if they truly were defeated, why were they tolerated and why could they be allowed positions in which they could

produce 'internal stresses'? One wishes that W.-C. would argue more elaborately and expansively on this highly important component of the understanding of Central Javanese history that she wishes to convey to the reader⁵¹.

As an aside, Wisseman-Christie asserts that the inscription of Wuatan Tija of 880 marks the 'first recorded appeal to the royal ancestors who protect the palace of the king of the state of Matarām'. It is not clear how she divines that the '*devata prasiddha mangraksa kadatuan*' mentioned in that inscription are indeed royal ancestors rather than just guardian spirits of the *kraton*.

ROM (p. 46) asserts that Rake Wungkal Humalang *dyaḥ* Jbang's name does not appear in the one inscription coming from his reign, but fails to note that the king is designated in that one inscription, Panunggalan of 896 A.D., as '*haji rakai watu humalarj*', that *watu* and *wungkal* are exactly synonymous and in fact interchanged as the title of the *rakadom* between the inscriptions of Mantyāsīḥ (907 A.D.) and Wanua Tengah III (908 A.D.), just as were the names of Panaraban and Panunggalan. Wisseman-Christie also notes that the respect that Watuhumalang shows for the '*raja i sam lūmāḥ i layam*' suggests that he is the child of that king, and that the phrase must refer to one of the rulers who followed Kayuwangi. Given the difficulty in assigning Kayuwangi's funeral ashes to the temple at Pāstika, the possibility must be kept open that it is Kayuwangi who was interred at Layang and therefore possibly the ancestor whose preferences were honored by Watuhumalang.

3e. "Balitung and the first years of phase five: stabilization and growing East Javanese influence (A.D. 898-910)": an evaluation

Writes Wisseman-Christie (p. 47): "One possible contributing factor to the continuing political volatility of the last two decades of the ninth century may have been the increasing geological instability of Central Java' and later notes that 'judging by the political instability that is known to have been provoked or exacerbated in Central Java by eruptions of Mount Merapi, and the inevitable accompanying earthquakes during the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, it is arguable that a series of volcanic eruptions and damaging earthquakes could have been similarly destabilizing in the ninth century.' She suggests that damage from the concomitant earthquakes may explain the hasty cover-up of the half-finished carvings at the base of Borobudur; if applied to the period in question, this suggestion would rather substantially violate others' chronologies of the history of Borobudur which place the monument earlier by a century or more, and furthermore gives very little time to make all of the other substantial modifications and additions to the temple which followed the erection of the emergency stabilization ring. If this period of volcanic instability occurred earlier than the end of the

⁵¹ Precisely this point was adduced by Kulke (1991:16), who noted the apparent subordination of the *rakryān* of Kanuruhan between 891 and 915. However, the 891 instance Kulke cites turns out to have occurred during the explicit 887-894 interregnum, so Kulke's point is unfortunately likely invalidated by unconsidered evidence. I know of no firm epigraphic evidence which would tend to sustain W.-C.'s assertion of the assumption of defeated nobles within the Javanese central court.

ninth century, then we should expect it to be a factor in the 'political volatility' of preceding reigns as well.

ROM (p. 47) asserts the occurrence of 'the major eruption of Mount Merapi in A.D. 928-929', thus neatly solving the problem, argued from many points of view by many different scholars, of why the kingdom shifted to the East (see Jordaan 1997:1-8 for a balanced overview of this debate). One would wish that some geological proof were forthcoming for this astounding statement.

Inscriptions under Balitung were issued with greater frequency and uniformity than under any of his predecessors according to ROM (p. 47). It should be noted that for all of Balitung's predecessors chronologized in the inscription of Wanua Tengah III with the exception of Kayuwangi, we have a minimum of zero and a maximum of one inscription issued under their names [Canggal, Kalasan, the Sanskrit excerpt from Wanua Tengah III, Tulang Er, Panunggalan]; it would be difficult to judge the 'uniformity' of any of them.

ROM (p. 48), citing van Naerssen, notes that Balitung's own *watak* lay in the Brantas delta. Wisseman-Christie notes that the emphasis by Balitung was on providing *sīma* for religious foundations, claiming that 'most of these holy places were apparently of a Hindu nature, though many of them also served as funerary temples of ancestors of members of the royal family and prominent members of the regional aristocracies, some of whom appear to have descended from the ruling families of small polities annexed by Matarām over time. A number of the *sīma* grants made in Central Java during his reign appear to have been connected with temples that were associated with deceased rulers and regional elites'. As was argued above, it is unclear how W.-C. divines that some of the *rakryān* descended from annexed ruling families; this is nowhere explicit or even implied in any inscription other than possibly Kumbhayoni's.

Wisseman-Christie (p. 48) reports the relocation of the *kraton* by Balitung: 'on 15 Oct, 904, Balitung moved from Nyū Gaḍiṅg to the re-established palace of Mataram- probably the palace of Mḍaṅ in Poh Pitu referred to in the Mantyaṣiḥ I inscription in A.D. 907. This date for the move to the new palace explains the line appended to the Kubukubu inscription, dated 17 October A.D. 905, which states that the ruler was "established in the palace". This must have been the first document issued after the move'. This observation of W.-C.'s is a positive contribution to modern understanding of the Balitung period; one hopes that some scholar will devote to the topic the essay it deserves.

I cannot agree with the subsequent statement of Wisseman-Christie, however, where she writes (p. 48): 'On the night of the move, however, Balitung apparently agreed, under advice from religious authorities, to restore to the monastery at Pikatan the *sīma* grant involving land at Wanua Tengah- in order to secure his hold over the throne.' The translation of the words '*yathanyan mapageh paluṅguh śrī maharaja iṅ kaḍatwan*' should be more properly translated as 'in order to secure the king's residence in the palace'. It is difficult to envision how, after six years on the throne, Balitung still needed to restore tax provisions to remote monasteries to secure his position on the throne, but it is easy to understand why he wanted to create an atmosphere of auspiciousness before he transferred his *kraton*.

3f. Summary evaluation of 'Revisiting Old Mataram'

As noted above, Wisseman-Christie (p. 32) summarized the five-fold importance of the Wanua Tengah III document in that it adds some unknown names to the kinglist, 'bring[s] some shadowy peripheral figures into the light', sorts out the chronology of the kings, helps 'to assess the validity of the division between the "Sañjaya" and "Śailendra" rulers, and to appreciate the turbulence of Mataram's history at various times'. While the first three items are factual and are inherent to the inscription, the latter two points require external explication and exposition. Although Wisseman-Christie's section on the fundamentally better-documented post-856 era is reasonably well conveyed and might serve as the bare bones for a historical summary (all future epigraphical discoveries in this era are likely to be evolutionary rather than revolutionary in their implications), this portion of the essay is nagged by many little errors of detail and careless reading of sources. I think that examination of the evidence shows that Wisseman-Christie failed to meet her own goals of exploring the division between "Sañjaya" and Śailendra, largely because of impossible matings of Śailendra consecration names with the kings of the Wanua Tengah III list as well as the thesis-nullifying obliviousness of the probable mention of Samaratuṅga in inscriptions ranging across 792-824. These fundamental errors are compounded by pervasive flaws in accurately reporting or evaluating the contents of the sources, both inscriptional and modern, which she uses to support her other arguments. In short, her treatment of the critical early Śailendra era is substantially confused and corresponds so poorly with the evidence that it would actually be misleading for scholars to read.

4. Observations on future efforts to untangle the history of Śailendra-era Java.

As I have noted above, both of the authors of the essays under consideration have failed to appreciate de Casparis' claim that the Śailendra king Samaratuṅga's name appears in two inscriptions, Abhayagirivihāra of 792 and Kayumwungan of 824. Until the discovery of the Wanua Tengah III inscription twenty years ago, a single-dynasty advocate could argue that this indicates that one of the 'Sañjaya' kings was very long-lived. With the Wanua Tengah III inscription crystallizing the dates of the Mantyāsiḥ kings, the presumption now lies with those who believe that the extant evidence from Central Java shows that two dynasties were at work: references to Samaratuṅga span the reigns of both Panaraban and Warak. This said, I do not in any way believe that the single-dynasty thesis is defunct⁵², but its tenability can only be rescued through the perceptive observation of the habitually prescient Damais (1968: 361) that Samaratuṅga seems already dead by 824 or else by calling into question de Casparis' original reading of Samaratuṅga's names in the Abhayagirivihāra and Kayumwungan inscriptions.

Another fault of both the authors of the reviewed works is their failure to examine the 'Śailendraness' of the kings of Java in the period of c. 778-824, and why dynastic participation in this

⁵² For some preliminary notes on how I believe the single-dynasty thesis must be argued, see Sundberg 2003:174-176. For a rebuttal of these remarks and the preliminary exposition of a triple or quadruple dynasty thesis, see Jordaan 2003. Solid epigraphical documentation of the type envisioned in Sundberg 2006b will go far in placing the history of Java on firmer factual grounds.

glorious blood-lineage was no longer claimed in extant inscriptions by the kings of the later Central Javanese period. In this regard, I wish to point out that the answers to this question seemingly lie in the successful decoding of the situation c. 830 at the Plaosan temple, immediately after the 824 issuance of the last known Śailendra inscription in Java.

Let us briefly examine this situation. Thanks to Kusen's efforts we can now firmly identify Garung and his court⁵³ as the primary builders of the votive shrines that surround the two large central edifices and as well to localize the territory under Garung's royal control to *at least* the area between Temanggung and the plains of Prambanan. De Casparis' researches (1956:175-206) lead to a translation of the extant stump of an immense Buddhist Siddham inscription that Bosch (1915) succeeded in identifying as originating from the Plaosan temple. Thanks to information derived from the 1956 archaeological campaign, we learn of the interesting fact that the northernmost of the two Plaosan temples was built over an earlier structure, a structure that most assuredly dates from the days the Śailendra held dominion over the plains of Prambanan. These facts lead me to stress the absolute importance of an understanding of Plaosan and the importance of detailed archaeological attention to this highly important site. More information, both from the discovery of new sources and the reexamination of older sources, may help resolve many interesting questions which arise from the presently accepted facts about the Plaosan temple. These questions include: What is the relationship between the Buddhist Śailendra and Garung? Was Garung a member of the Śailendra family? Is the apparently last official mention of the Javanese Śailendra in 824 related to the strange and unique designation of the paternity of Garung in the Wanua Tengah inscription? Is there a relationship between the admixture of male-female royal reliefs of the temples and the fact that the last known mention of the Śailendra featured a princess rather than a king or prince? Is there still an element of plausibility in de Casparis' famous thesis of a dynastic union between Śailendra and Sañjaya, even if we must amend the actors to Garung and Śrī Kahulunnan?

Given the absolute importance of acquiring data concerning the Plaosan temple, it is both sad and disconcerting that more information has not been harvested from the newer portion of a Siddham inscription found in 1975 and mentioned by Boechari (1976: 18 n. 13), where he writes:

Recently a big stone inscription, written in Sanskrit with *siddhamāṭṛka* script, was discovered in front of Caṇḍi Plaosan Lor. Regrettably it is badly weathered and found smashed to pieces; only the left half is recovered up to the present. A unique feature of this inscription is that a building was especially made to house the inscription....

The script is very much like that of the stone fragment numbered D 82 in the Jakarta Museum, which is supposed to originate from Caṇḍi Plaosan too... But whether they belong together cannot be made out at present. We are still looking for a date in these newly discovered fragments.

I have sought without success further concrete information concerning the fragments of this inscription, which seems to have disappeared- I can only surmise that it together with the 771 Boyolali

⁵³ Sundberg 2006a:117 n.39 adds to considerations of the dating of the Plaosan shrines.

inscription were sold by a corrupt official sometime during the late 1970's. The one person I could locate who had actually seen the Plaosan inscription, Prof. Riboet Darmosoetropo of Universitas Gajah Madah mentioned that he had made a preliminary investigation with Boechari shortly after the inscription's discovery but that large portions of the inscription were illegible or obscure. The discovery location as mentioned by Boechari would seem to confirm that it is a portion of the D 82 inscription: the conspicuous remains of the small stone building mentioned by Boechari is dead in the middle forefront of the temple, exactly where Crawford in 1815 described a blackened inscription of such remarkable thickness that it could only be the inscription of Plaosan. And yet, mysteries remain: my measurements show that the little remains of the building to the forefront of Plaosan are likely too small for such a massive inscription as D 82, and furthermore the remains are oriented East-West whereas we would expect North-South in order to provide a sense of symmetry for the reader of this single-sided inscription. Furthermore, Prof. Darmosoetopo, could not recall that the newly-found Plaosan fragments shared the conspicuous and indelibly memorable thickness of D 82, although we must allow for the fact that thirty years had passed since he last had seen the inscription. Finally, Boechari described the left side of the newly found portion: D 82 is also the left side of an inscription. Until proven otherwise by the rediscovery of the newer Plaosan fragments, we must entertain the possibility that fragments of two different inscriptions have been recovered from the site.

Plaosan is not the only missing inscription that might otherwise lead us into a much clearer atmosphere regarding ancient Central Java during the Śailendra phase and its connection to the later post-824 kings of Central Java. The afore-mentioned 771 A.D. Buddhist inscription, reportedly from a female merchant and recovered from Boyolali, would be an important piece of evidence for the understanding of Javanese Buddhism in one of our historical blind-spots. The painted votive inscriptions of Prambanan have never been published. At least one substantial lithic inscription now in the museum in Dieng remains unstudied. Several short metal inscriptions recovered from the foundation boxes of temples have not received the detailed attention, or even documentation, they deserve.

A 21st century understanding of physics will also play its role in enabling a better understanding of 9th century Java. In a recent publication (Sundberg 2006b) I laid out four proven techniques for the production of high-fidelity facsimiles of inscriptions including one (the spectrally selective X-ray fluorescence of the metal debris left from the lapicides' chisels) which has the capacity to map portions of the inscriptions which are presently illegible. At the very least, the techniques should be applied to the grand inscriptions of the Śailendra: Kalasan, Kelurak, Abhayagirivihara, Kayumwungan, and Plaosan, as well as the funeral stele of King Pikatan, in the expectation of resolving some of the essential historical mysteries of the period.

Barring fresh discoveries of Śailendra-era inscriptions from Sewu, Barabudur, and the other great sites of Buddhist Java, the studies of these inscriptions are the brightest hope we have for achieving greater clarity in our knowledge of the astonishing history of the state of Matarām.

I wish to thank Prof. Riboet Darmosoetrobo for sharing his memories of his preliminary examinations of the Plaosan fragments found 30 years ago. I would like to thank Roy Jordaan for providing me with a copy of his 2003 conference paper and Mark Long for spotting several errors in an early draft of this paper.

5. Bibliography:

Barrett-Jones, A.M.

1984 *Early Tenth Century Java from the Inscriptions: a Study of Economic, Social and Administrative Conditions in the First Quarter of the Century* VKI 107, Dordrecht: Foris Publication

Boechari

1976 *Some considerations of the problem of the shift of Mataram's center of government from central to east Java in the 10th century A.D.*, Bulletin of the Research Centre of Archaeology of Indonesia, No. 10, Jakarta Pusat Penelitian Purbakala dan Peninggalan Nasional.

n.d. *Transkripsi sementara prasasti Wanua Tengah III.*

Casparis, J.G.de

1950 *Prasasti Indonesia I; Inscriptions uit de Çailendra-tijd.* Bandung: Nix.

1956 *Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th Century A.D.* Bandung: Masa Baru

1961 'New evidence on cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in ancient times', *Artibus Asiae*, 24, pp. 241-248

1975 *Indonesian Paleography: A History of Writing in Indonesia from the beginnings to c. A.D. 1500*, Leiden: E.J. Brill

1981 'The dual nature of Borobudur', in: Gomez and Woodward (eds.) *Borobudur: History and Significance of a Buddhist Monument*, Berkeley, University of California Press, pp. 47-83.

1986 'Some Notes On Relations Between Central and Local Government in Ancient Java (Mainly During the 10th Century)', in David Marr and A.C. Milner (eds), *South East Asia in the 9th to 14th Centuries*, Singapore, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

1990 'Introduction', in Soekmono, de Casparis, and Dumarçay, *Borobudur: Prayer in Stone*, London: Thames and Hudson.

2000 'Review of: Roy E. Jordaan, *The Sailendras in Central Javanese history: a survey of research from 1950 to 1999*, BKI, 156:814-816.

Chandra, L.

1980 'Borobudur, a new interpretation', in Dallapiccola, A.L. (ed.), *The Stūpa: Its Religious, Historical, and Architectural Significance*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag

1994 'The Sailendras of Java', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 67-68 for 1992-1993 (combined): 64-102.

1995 'The contacts of Abhayagiri of Srilanka with Indonesia in the eighth century' *Cultural Horizons of India*, Vol. 4. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture and Aditya Prakashan.

Chihara, D.

1996 *Hindu Buddhist Architecture in South East Asia*, Leiden: E. J. Brill

Coèdes, G.

1959 'L'inscription de la stèle de Ligor: état présent de son interprétation', *Oriens Extremus*, 6, 1959, pp. 42-48

Crawford, J

1967 *History of the Indian archipelago; containing an account of the manners, arts, languages, religions, institutions, and commerce of its inhabitants* (3 volumes). London: Cass.

Damais, L.-Ch.

1949 'Epigrafische aantekeningen', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 83:1-26.

1952 'Études d'épigraphie Indonésienne, III. Liste des principales inscriptions datées de l'Indonésie', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 46: 1-105.

1957 'Bibliographie: Riwayat Indonesia, djilid I', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 48:607-649.

1963 'Bibliographie indonésienne V: Les publications épigraphiques du Service Archéologiques de l'Indonésie', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 51 (2):538-582.

1965 'Pre-seventeenth century Indonesian history: sources and directions', in Kahin, Rensink, and Soejatmako (eds), *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography*, Cornell: Cornell University Press.

- 1968a 'Bibliographie indonésienne: XI. Les publications épigraphiques du Service Archéologiques de l'Indonésie', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 54:295-522.
- 1968b 'Etudes Soumatranaises III: la langue B des inscriptions de Sri Vijaya', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 54:523-566.
- 1970 'Répertoire onomastique de l'épigraphie Javanaise', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, LXVI
Herry Santosa, H.B.
- 1994 'Prasasti Tulang Er 198 Sanjaya', *Berkala Arkeologi*, Tahun XIV, Edisi Khusus, pp. 186-190.
- Jordaan, R
- 1993 *Imagine Buddha in Prambanan; Reconsidering the Buddhist background of the Loro Jonggrang temple complex*. Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.
- 1996 *In Praise of Prambanan; Dutch essays on the Loro Jonggrang temple complex*. Leiden: KITLV Press
- 1999 *The Śailendras in Central Javanese History; A Survey of Research from 1950-1999*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- 2000 'Pāla chronology, the dating of the Nālandā inscription, and the end of Śailendra rule in Java', *Paper for the 8th International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists, Sarteano (Tuscanay), Italy, 2-6 October, 2000*.
- 2003 'Wanua Tengah III and the problem of the origin of the Śailendra dynasty', *Paper for the International Conference on Indonesian Art, 4-6 March 2003, at the Indira Gandhi National Gallery for the Arts, in New Delhi, India*.
- Kulke, H.
- 1991 'Epigraphical references to the "city" and the "state" in Early Indonesia', *Indonesia*, 1991No. 52, pp. 3-22.
- Kusen
- 1984 'Temuan Baru dari Temanggung. Prasasti Raja Balitung 830 Saka', *Kompas*, Minggu, 6 Mei 1984.
- 1988 *Prasasti Wanua Tengah III*, unpublished translation
- 1994 'Raja-raja Mataram Kuna dari Sanjaya sampai Balitung: sebuah rekonstruksi berdasarkan prasasti Wanua Tengah III', *Berkala Arkeologi*, Tahun XIV, Edisi Khusus, pp. 82-94.
- 1995 'Identifikasi toponim dalam prasasti Jawa Kuna abad IX-X dari Prambanan dan sekitarnya dengan toponim masa kini', in *Analisis Hasil Penelitian Arkeologi; Analysis Sumba Tertulis Masa Klasik*, pp. 197-210. Jakarta: Puslitarken.
- Nastiti, T.N.,
- 1996 'Eksistensi Kekuasaan Rakai Watukura Dyah Balitung (898-910 M)', *Amerta: Berkala Arkeologi*, 1996, 29-42
- Naerssen, F.H. Van
- 1947 "The Çailendra Interregnum," *India Antiqua*:249-253.
- Oemar, M.
- 1970 'Prasasti Munduan', in *Seminar Sejarah Nasional Indonesia II: Yogyakarta OV/Oudheidkundig Verslag*
1912-1929
Oudheidkundig Verslag van de Oudheidkundige Dienst in Nederlandsch-Indië. Batavia/Bandung: Albrecht/Nix
- Sarkar, H.
- 1972 *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java*. Calcutta: Mukhopadhyay. [2 Vols.]
- Santosa, H.
- 1994 'Prasasti Tulang Er 198 Sanjaya', *Berkala Arkeologi*, Tahun XIV, Edisi Khusus, pp. 186-190.
- Sundberg, J.
- 2003 'A Buddhist mantra recovered from the Ratu Baka plateau: A preliminary study of its implications for Śailendra-era Java', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* Vol. 159 No. 1: 163-188.
- 2004 'The wilderness monks of the Abhayagirivihāra and the origins of Sino-Javanese esoteric Buddhism', *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, Vol. 160, No. 1:95-123.
- 2006a 'Considerations on the dating of the Barabudur stūpa', *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, Vol. 162-1 (2006):95-132.

2006b 'A note on the importance of developing digital facsimiles and a digital register of Javanese inscriptions',
Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde, Vol. 162-1 (2006):133-136.

Teeuw, A.

2001 'Kahulunan and Srii Kahulunan', in Klokke and Kooij (eds.), *Fruits of Inspiration: Studies in Honour of Prof. J. G. de Casparis*, Groningen, Egberg Gorsten, pp. 525-538

Trigangga

1994 'Analysis pertanggalan prasasti Wanua Tengah III', *Berkala Arkeologi*, Tahun XIV, Edisi Khusus, p. 22-27.

Wisseman-Christie, J.

2001 'Revisiting early Mataram', in Klokke and Kooij (eds.), *Fruits of Inspiration: Studies in Honour of Prof. J. G. de Casparis*, pp. 25-56. Groningen: Egberg Gorsten.

Zoetmulder, P.

1982 *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*. The Hague: Nijhoff and KITLV

Copywrite 2001, 2003, 2006 Jeffrey Sundberg.